

INEQUALITY INC.

How corporate power
divides our world
and the need for a new
era of public action



OXFAM

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	3
Foreword by Bernie Sanders, United States Senator	5
Foreword by Rokeya Rafique, Executive Director, Karmojibi Nari	6
Executive summary	7
Chapter 1: A Gilded Age of division	16
1.1 A brutal world for billions of people	18
1.2 A wonderful world for the few at the top	20
1.3 Corporate profits surge during this time of crisis	22
1.4 The link between corporate power and extreme wealth	23
Chapter 2: A new era of monopoly power	25
2.1 Monopolies fuel inequality	26
2.2 Peak monopoly power	27
2.3 Big Pharma, Big Tech, big everything	28
2.4 Monopoly money	31
2.5 Learning lessons from the past	31
2.6 From democracy to plutocracy	32
Chapter 3: How corporate power fuels inequality	33
3.1 Rewarding the wealthy, not the workers	34
3.2 Dodging taxes	38
3.3 Privatizing public services	41
3.4 Driving climate breakdown	44
Chapter 4: Towards an economy for all	47
4.1 A radical increase in equality must be humanity's most urgent priority	48
4.2 Reining in corporate power: three practical steps	49
4.3 Room for hope	54
Endnotes	55

Interactive use

For digital users, please click on the contents page to go to the desired section. To return to the contents page, click on the heading at the top left of the page.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

© Oxfam International January 2024

Lead authors: Rebecca Riddell, Nabil Ahmed, Alex Maitland, Max Lawson and Anjela Taneja.

Contributing authors: Alex Bush, Alexandre Poidatz, Andrew Gogo, Anthony Kamande, Christian Hallum, Gustavo Ferroni, Henry Ushie, Inigo Macias Aymar, Jonas Gielfeldt, Lies Craeynest, Mariana Anton, Martin Brehm Christensen, Nafkote Dabi, Rachel Noble, Sunil Acharya, Susana Ruiz, Uwe Gneiting and Yaxkin Rodriguez.

Commissioning manager: Anjela Taneja.

Oxfam acknowledges the assistance of Ally Davies, Anna Marriott, Annie Thériault, Ashley Hart, Barbara Scottu, Dana Abed, Deepak Xavier, Ed Pomfret, Emma Seery, Enrique Naveda, Grazielle Custodio, Irene Guijt, Irit Tamir, Jane Garton, Joss Saunders, Juan Sebastian Pardo, Kira Boe, Lies Craeynest, Linda Odour Noah, Lucy Cowie, Mahmuda Sultana, Morgane Menichini, Robbie Silverman, Rod Goodbun, Ruth Mhlanga, Sandra Sánchez Migallón, Seán McTernan and Victoria Harnett.

Designed by Nigel Willmott with data visualization support from Julie Brunet.

Oxfam is grateful to a range of experts and organizations who generously gave their assistance: the American Economic Liberties Project, Âurea Mouzinho, the Balanced Economy Project, Christoph Lakner, Claire Godfrey, Daniel Gerszon Mahler, Danny Dorling, Erik Peinert, Grieve Chelwa, Michelle Meagher, Nicholas Shaxson, Nick Dearden, Nidhi Hegde, Niko Lusiani, Sarah Bradbury, Sofia del Valle, Nishant Yonzan, and the World Benchmarking Alliance.

This paper was written to inform public debate on development and humanitarian policy issues.

For further information on the issues raised in this paper please email advocacy@oxfaminternational.org

This publication is copyright, but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged.

Email: policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under DOI: 10.21201/2024.000007

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

Photo credits

Cover photo: Garment workers protest to demand an increase in minimum wages in Dhaka, Bangladesh on 31 October 2023.

Photo by Kazi Salahuddin Razu/NurPhoto via Getty Images.

Page 7: Aerial view of a luxury dive boat in the Maldives.

Photo by Aleksei Permiakov/Getty Images.

Page 16: Mumbai cityscape, Maharashtra, India.

Photo by Adrian Catalin Lazar/iStock Images.

Page 25: Hand holding puppet strings.

Photo by Sveta Zi/iStock Images.

Page 33: A factory worker assembles shoes at the Lien Phat factory in Binh Duong province, Vietnam.

Photo by Aaron Joel Santos Images/Shutterstock.

Page 47: In the UK, millionaires proposing a solution to inequality project the words 'TAX WEALTH NOT WORK' on to the Bank of England. Photo by the Patriotic Millionaires UK.

Since 2020, the richest five men in the world have doubled their fortunes. During the same period, almost five billion people globally have become poorer. Hardship and hunger are a daily reality for many people worldwide. At current rates, it will take 230 years to end poverty, but we could have our first trillionaire in 10 years.


A huge concentration of global corporate and monopoly power is exacerbating inequality economy-wide. Seven out of ten of the world's biggest corporates have either a billionaire CEO or a billionaire as their principal

shareholder. Through squeezing workers, dodging tax, privatizing the state and spurring climate breakdown, corporations are driving inequality and acting in the service of delivering ever-greater wealth to their rich owners. To end extreme inequality, governments must radically redistribute the power of billionaires and corporations back to ordinary people.

A more equal world is possible if governments effectively regulate and reimagine the private sector.



Beijing skyline, China. Photo by Li Yang/Unsplash.



Each and every year, Oxfam does an extraordinary job in shining a spotlight on the rapid movement toward global oligarchy, in which just a handful of billionaires own and control a major part of the world economy. And each year, the movement toward global oligarchy becomes more pronounced and more obscene.

Here is the harsh economic reality we must confront:

Never before in human history have so few owned so much.

Never before in human history has there been such income and wealth inequality.

Never before in history have we had such huge concentrations of ownership.

Never before in history have we seen a billionaire class with so much political power.

And never before have we seen this unprecedented level of greed, arrogance and irresponsibility on the part of the ruling class.

In the United States, three people own more wealth than the bottom half of society, while over 60% of workers live paycheck to paycheck. Despite massive increases in worker productivity and an explosion in technology, real weekly wages for the average American worker are lower today than they were 50 years ago.

But, as Oxfam points out, this is clearly not just an American issue. It is a global issue. Since 2020, while nearly five billion people throughout the world have been made poorer, the five richest men on the planet have become twice as wealthy and are now worth more than US\$800 billion. More than US\$800 billion in wealth – for just five people!

While millions of people throughout the world live in dire poverty, without clean drinking water, adequate healthcare, decent housing, or education for their kids, the world's billionaires have increased their wealth by over US\$3 trillion in the last three years alone. That's trillion with a 't'.

Billionaires become richer, the working class struggles, and the poor live in desperation. That is the unfortunate state of the world economy.

That is the bad news. But here is the good news. Thanks to organizations like Oxfam, more and more people throughout the world are making the connections between the harsh economic reality of their lives and the destructive nature of our uber-capitalist system which rewards greed and profiteering above any other human value.

Workers in the United States and throughout the world are making it clear that they are sick and tired of being ripped off and exploited. They are no longer sitting back and allowing large corporations to make record-breaking profits while they fall further and further behind. They are fighting back and many of them are winning substantial increases in wages, benefits and working conditions.

Here is the simple truth: If we stand together in our common humanity there are enormous opportunities in front of us to create a better life for all.

We can guarantee healthcare as a human right to every man, woman and child. We can combat climate change, save the planet and create tens of millions of good-paying green energy jobs in the process. We can use the advancements in technology and worker productivity to improve our lives. We can eliminate poverty and increase life expectancy.

We can do all of that and more if we are prepared to bring low-income and working people all over the world together to build an international movement that takes on the greed and ideology of the billionaire class and leads us to a world based on economic, social and environmental justice.

This report brings us closer together. I greatly appreciate Oxfam's leadership to combat global oligarchy and to help create a more just world.

Bernie Sanders
United States Senator



I am proud to lead Karmojibi Nari (KN), a non-profit, non-government, women-headed organization in Bangladesh. Working since 1991, we are still marching on the road to ensure women's rights, dignity, power and authority. Our mission is to create a just and egalitarian society free from exploitation, deprivation and discrimination; a society in which women workers, women and labourers enjoy their rights, dignity, power and authority.

We work to organize my working-class sisters working in the garment industry; we fight for their rights, risking death to fight for greater equality. The minimum wage for garment workers in Bangladesh has remained unchanged since 2019 at Tk. 8,000 per month (US\$73). This is only one-third of a living wage. Meanwhile, the cost of living has significantly risen due to inflation, with food prices increasing by 21% to 50% between 2022 and 2023.

Many garment workers are trapped in debt and have to borrow money to meet basic needs like food, medicine and transport. They work about 11 hours a day, six days a week, rarely receiving sick pay despite this being a legal requirement. They are often working into the night to meet impossible production targets, sometimes having to work all night long. Safety is a fear for all; we often hear of women being injured at work and many are afraid of factory fires because of blocked exits. After 47 workers died in a fire at a garment factory in Chittagong in 2006, Karmojibi

Nari has been working on this issue as a founder member of the Workers Safety Forum (SNF). Our organization was the secretariate of the forum and has held dialogues with the Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers Export Association (BGMEA) and other related stakeholders and duty bearers.

We work to organize and educate working-class women to understand their rights and to fight for them; to understand that they are part of a huge global system. A system that extracts wealth from their labour. A system that seeks to exploit women in Global South countries such as Bangladesh.

The garments they sew during long hours in the factory are sold in rich nations, often for more money than the garment workers are paid in a month. This money does not go to them, but to the owners of the clothing companies, the fashion corporations far away, and their rich male shareholders in rich countries, some of them billionaires. These billionaires have more money than a garment worker could earn in a thousand lifetimes. Who could ever justify such wealth built on the suffering of my sisters sweating each day?

This Oxfam report has shown me more than ever how the power of these huge corporations and their billionaire owners grows seemingly ever stronger, and that we can never have an equal world until we confront that power and overcome it.

The struggles of my organization, trade unions in Bangladesh, and the many working-class Bangladeshi women are linked to a global struggle with activists across the world fighting inequality and corporate power. Together we must keep fighting, and together I believe we will win.

Rokeya Rafique
Executive Director, Karmojibi Nari (KN)

কর্মজীবী নারী
KARMOJIBI NARI (KN)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



A DECADE OF DIVISION

→ Jeff Bezos is one of the world's richest men. His fortune of US\$167.4bn has increased by US\$32.7bn since 2020.¹ Bezos flew to space for US\$5.5bn and thanked Amazon workers for making this possible.² Amazon has a history of making efforts to prevent unionizing by workers.³

→ Reverend Ryan Brown works at an Amazon fulfillment center in North Carolina. He describes the work as physically demanding, monotonous and grueling, with workers subject to racism and discrimination. He is involved in workplace organizing to address racism and secure a living wage.⁴

→ Seafood-processing workers in Southeast Asia have supplied food to supermarkets such as Amazon-owned Whole Foods and others.⁵ Workers in this industry include Susi, who used to work at a shrimp factory. She said, 'While we were working there wasn't time to rest. I was not allowed to drink.'⁶

The wealth of the world's five richest billionaires has more than doubled since the start of this decade, while 60% of humanity has grown poorer.⁷ For years, Oxfam has raised the alarm about widening and extreme inequality. As we enter 2024, the very real danger is that these extraordinary extremes are becoming the new normal. Corporate and monopoly power, as this paper shows, is an unrelenting inequality-generating machine.

The 2020s offer opportunities for leaders to take our world in a bold, new, fairer direction. This is yet to happen. An era of widening inequality has coincided with a narrowing of economic imagination. We are living through what appears to be the start of a decade of division: in just three years, we have experienced a global pandemic, war, a cost-of-living crisis and climate breakdown. Each crisis has widened the gulf – not so much between the rich and people living in poverty, but between an oligarchic few and the vast majority.



Workers campaigning for unionization in Philadelphia, USA. Photo by Joe Piette/Flickr.

This paper lays out our fundamental choice: between a new age of billionaire supremacy, controlled by monopolists and financiers, or transformative public power that is founded upon equality and dignity.

Box ES: Inequality in numbers

- Since 2020, and the beginning of this decade of division, the five richest men in the world have seen their fortunes more than double, while almost five billion people have seen their wealth fall.⁸
- If each of the five wealthiest men were to spend a million US dollars daily, they would take 476 years to exhaust their combined wealth.⁹
- Seven out of ten of the world's biggest corporations have a billionaire CEO or a billionaire as their principal shareholder.^{10, 11}
- Globally, men own US\$105 trillion more wealth than women – the difference in wealth is equivalent to more than four times the size of the US economy.¹²
- The world's richest 1% own 59% of all global financial assets.¹³
- The richest 1% globally emit as much carbon pollution as the poorest two-thirds of humanity.¹⁴
- In the USA, the wealth of a typical Black household is just 15.8% of that of a typical white household.¹⁵ In Brazil, on average, white people have incomes more than 70% higher than those of Afro-descendants.¹⁶
- Just 0.4% of over 1,600 of the world's largest and most influential companies are publicly committed to paying their workers a living wage and support payment of a living wage in their value chains.¹⁷
- It would take 1,200 years for a female worker in the health and social sector to earn what a CEO in the biggest Fortune 100 companies earns on average in one year.¹⁸

A brutal world for the many

For most people around the world, the start of this decade has been incredibly hard. At the time of writing, 4.8 billion people are poorer than they were in 2019.¹⁹ For the poorest people, who are more likely to be women, racialized peoples, and marginalized groups in every society, daily life has become more brutal still. Global inequality – the gap between Global North and the Global South – has grown for the first time in 25 years.²⁰

Prices are outpacing pay the world over,²¹ with hundreds of millions of people seeing their wages buy less each month and their prospects of a better future disappear. Climate breakdown, driven by the super-rich, is dramatically increasing global inequality.²² Protests and strikes by workers have repeatedly made the news headlines and filled the front pages.²³

Governments are finding it impossible to stay financially afloat in the face of mounting debt and the escalating costs of importing fuel, food and medicines. Low- and lower-middle-income countries are set to pay nearly half a billion US dollars a day in interest and debt payments between now and 2029, and they are having to make severe cuts to spending to be able to pay their creditors.²⁴ These cuts are often felt particularly acutely by women.²⁵

A wonderful world for the few

Meanwhile, the dramatic increase in extreme wealth witnessed since 2020 has become set in stone. Billionaires are now US\$3.3 trillion or 34% richer than they were at the beginning of this decade of crisis, with their wealth growing three times as fast as the rate of inflation.²⁶

This wealth is concentrated in the Global North. Only 21% of humanity lives in the countries of the Global North, but these countries are home to 69% of private wealth, and 74% of the world's billionaire wealth.²⁷ The other big winners in this period of crisis are global corporations. For huge corporations, just as for super-rich individuals, the last two decades have been extraordinarily lucrative and the last few years have been better still: the biggest firms experienced an 89% leap in profits in 2021 and 2022.²⁸ New data shows that 2023 is set to shatter all records as the most profitable yet. Eighty-two percent of these profits are

used to benefit shareholders,²⁹ who are overwhelmingly among the richest people in every society.

The link between extreme wealth and corporate power

Sharply increasing billionaire wealth and rising corporate and monopoly power are deeply connected. The profits of mega-corporations are in turn used to benefit shareholders, at the expense of workers and ordinary people. This paper reveals how corporate and monopoly power has exploded inequality – and how corporate power exploits and magnifies inequalities of gender and race, as well as economic inequality.


The report uses new data to demonstrate that the richest people are not only the biggest beneficiaries of the global economy but exercise significant control over it too.

New research by Oxfam illuminates just how much of the world's financial assets are owned by the top 1%. Using data from Wealth X, we have found that the richest 1% own 59% of

all global financial assets.³⁰ In the Middle East, the richest 1% hold 72% of financial wealth; in Asia, the richest 1% own 58% of wealth; and in Europe, the richest 1% own 56% of wealth.

Looking at the 50 biggest public corporations in the world, billionaires are either the principal shareholder or the CEO of 34% of these corporates, with a total market capitalization of US\$13.3 trillion.^{31, 32} Seven out of the ten biggest publicly listed corporates in the world have a billionaire as CEO or as principal shareholder.³³ A principal shareholder's voting shares allow the shareholder to vote on who should be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and who should sit on the company's board of directors.

Billionaire owners use this control to ensure that corporate power is constantly growing through increasing market concentration and monopoly, enabled by government. This increased corporate power is in turn focused on providing ever-greater returns to them, the shareholders, at the expense of everyone else.



**THE WORLD'S FIVE RICHEST MEN
HAVE MORE THAN DOUBLED
THEIR WEALTH SINCE 2020,
WHILE FIVE BILLION PEOPLE
WERE MADE POORER.**



A NEW ERA OF MONOPOLY: THE SUPERCHARGING OF CORPORATE POWER

We are living through an era of monopoly power that enables corporations to control markets, set the terms of exchange, and profit without fear of losing business. Far from being an abstract phenomenon, this impacts us in many ways: influencing the wages we are paid, the foods we eat and can afford, and the medicines we can access. Far from being accidental, this power has been handed to monopolies by our governments.

In sector after sector, increased market concentration can be seen everywhere. Globally, over two decades, 60 pharmaceutical companies merged into just 10 giant, global 'Big Pharma' firms between 1995–2015.³⁴ Two international companies now own more than 40% of the global seed market.³⁵ 'Big Tech' firms dominate markets: three-quarters of global online advertising spending pays Meta, Alphabet and Amazon;³⁶ and more than 90% of global online search is done via Google.³⁷ Agriculture has seen

consolidation within Africa.³⁸ India faces 'rising industrial concentration', especially by the top five firms.³⁹

Monopolies increase the power of corporations and their owners to the detriment of everyone else. Bodies such as the IMF agree that monopolistic power is growing and contributing to inequality.⁴⁰ Average markups for mega-corporations have ballooned in recent decades;⁴¹ while monopoly power enabled large firms in many concentrated sectors to implicitly coordinate to increase prices to drive up their margins since 2021,⁴² with energy, food and pharma sectors seeing huge price hikes.⁴³

Private equity firms, backed globally by US\$5.8 trillion of investors' cash since 2009, have used privileged financial access to act as a monopolizing force across sectors.^{44, 45} Beyond private equity, the 'Big Three' index fund managers – BlackRock, State Street and Vanguard – together manage some US\$20 trillion in people's assets, close to one-fifth of all assets under management,⁴⁶ which has deepened monopoly power.⁴⁷

**OF THE TEN BIGGEST
CORPORATIONS
IN THE WORLD,
SEVEN EITHER HAVE
A BILLIONAIRE CEO
OR A BILLIONAIRE AS
PRINCIPAL SHAREHOLDER.**

**THE TOTAL VALUE
OF THESE COMPANIES
IS \$10.2 TRILLION.**



Four ways that corporate power fuels inequality

Increasing monopolization has supercharged corporate power, which is directed at one primary goal above all others: increasing returns to shareholders. In order to maximize shareholder returns, corporations use this power to act in ways that drive and further entrench inequality. This report looks at four of the ways this is done:

1. Rewarding the wealthy, not the workers


Corporations drive inequality by using their power to force wages down and direct profits to the ultra-wealthy. In 2022, the International Labour Organization (ILO) warned that the historic decline in real wages could increase inequality and fuel social unrest.⁴⁸ Our own analysis for this report finds that 791 million workers have seen their wages fail to keep up with inflation and as a result have lost US\$1.5 trillion over the last two years, equivalent to nearly a month (25 days) of lost wages for each worker.⁴⁹ Women are vastly overrepresented in the poorest-paid and least

secure jobs,⁵⁰ and in 2019, earned just 51 cents for every US\$1 in labour income earned by men.⁵¹ Racialized peoples face exploitation in supply chains,⁵² and white people disproportionately benefit from the profits generated by corporations.⁵³

Further, corporations have used their influence to oppose labour laws and policies that could benefit workers, such as fighting minimum wage increases,⁵⁴ reforms that undermine workers’ rights,⁵⁵ political restrictions on unionization,⁵⁶ and rollbacks to child labour laws.⁵⁷

2. Dodging taxes

Corporations and their wealthy owners also drive inequality by undertaking a sustained and highly effective war on taxation. The statutory corporate income tax rate has more than halved in OECD countries since 1980.⁵⁸ Aggressive tax planning, abuse of tax havens, and incentives result in tax rates that are much lower, and often closer to zero.⁵⁹



This drives inequality in a number of ways. Corporate taxes are disproportionately borne by the richest, thus the collapse in corporate taxes in recent decades has essentially provided another tax cut for the wealthy.⁶⁰ It has also deprived governments around the world, but especially in the Global South, of trillions of US dollars in revenue that could be used to reduce inequality and end poverty.⁶¹ Every tax dollar dodged is a nurse that will never be hired or a school that cannot be built.

3. Privatizing public services

Around the world, corporate power is relentlessly pushing into the public sector, commodifying and segregating access to vital services such as education, water and healthcare, often while enjoying massive, taxpayer-backed profits.⁶² This can gut governments’ ability to deliver the type of high-quality, universal public services that can reduce inequality.⁶³

The stakes are huge. Essential services constitute trillion-dollar industries and immense opportunities for generating profit and wealth for rich shareholders. The World Bank and other development finance actors have prioritized private service provision, effectively treating basic services as asset classes and using public money to guarantee

corporate returns rather than human rights.⁶⁴ Private equity firms are snapping up everything from water systems to healthcare providers and nursing homes, amid a litany of concerns about poor and even tragic outcomes.⁶⁵


Privatization can drive and reinforce inequalities in vital public services, entrenching gaps between rich and poor, excluding and impoverishing those who cannot pay while those who can pay are able to access good healthcare and education.⁶⁶ Privatization can also drive inequalities on the basis of gender,⁶⁷ race,⁶⁸ and caste. For example, Oxfam found that Dalits in India face high and unaffordable out-of-pocket fees in the private healthcare sector,⁶⁹ financial exclusion in the private education sector; and overt discrimination in both.⁷⁰

4. Driving climate breakdown

Corporate power is driving climate breakdown, in turn causing great suffering and exacerbating inequalities, including along lines of race, class and gender.⁷¹ Many of the world’s billionaires own, control, shape and financially profit from processes that emit greenhouse gases,⁷² and benefit when corporations seek to block progress on a fast and just transition, deny and spin the truth about climate change, and crush those who oppose fossil fuel extraction.⁷³

FIGURE ES: RICH PEOPLE IN THE GLOBAL NORTH STILL OWN THE WORLD

Share of wealth concentration in the Global North compared to the rest of the world (%)



Source: Oxfam calculation based on data from Forbes billionaires list⁷⁴ and the UBS Global Wealth Report 2023.⁷⁵

IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE THIS WAY: AN ECONOMY FOR ALL IS POSSIBLE

Runaway corporate power and runaway extreme wealth have been contained and curbed in the past and can be again. This report outlines concrete, proven and practical ways to make the economy work for all of us.

Set goals and plans to radically reduce inequality fast

There is broad agreement that inequality is too high in almost every nation and globally.⁷⁶ In 2023, world-leading economists including Jayati Ghosh and Thomas Piketty⁷⁷ came together with former UN, IMF and World Bank staff

to call for clear targets to be set for inequality reduction. Oxfam supports the idea, proposed by Joseph Stiglitz,⁷⁸ that every nation should aim for a situation in which inequality is reduced to the point where the bottom 40% of the population have around the same income as the richest 10%, known as a Palma of 1.⁷⁹

The richest governments have a particular responsibility, given their disproportionate influence in setting global rules and norms. The role of the Brazilian-led G20 and the efforts of Global South nations at the UN offer vital opportunities for multilateral action to tackle national and global inequality.



Mariam is part of a cooperative in Mali that makes improved cooking firepits; these firepits reduce deforestation and the time women spend collecting firewood. Photo by Diafara Traoré/Oxfam.

Reining in corporate power: three practical steps

1. Revitalize the state

A strong and effective state is the best bulwark against corporate power. It is a provider of public goods; a maker and shaper of markets; a corrector of market failures; and an owner and operator of national commercial ventures, accounting for up to 40% of domestic output worldwide in 2018.⁸⁰ Governments need to take a proactive role in shaping their economies for the common good. They must:

- Guarantee inequality-busting public services including healthcare, education, care services and food security.
- Invest in public transport, energy, housing, and other public infrastructure.
- Explore a public monopoly or a public option in sectors that are prone to monopoly power and key to tackling extreme inequality and driving a rapid transition away from fossil fuels. These could include public energy, public transport (where the infrastructure investment costs mean there can only be one efficient provider), and other sectors where there is a significant national benefit.⁸¹
- Improve the transparency, accountability and oversight of public institutions (including state-owned enterprises).
- Strengthen, finance and staff regulatory capacity to enforce regulations to ensure that the private sector serves the common good.

2. Regulate corporations

Governments need to use their power to rein in the runaway power of corporates and prevent injustices across their supply chains, nationally and internationally. They must:

- Break up private monopolies and curb corporate power. Governments can learn from current anti-monopoly cases, such as those in the USA and Europe, and from the lessons of history where wealth concentration was

successfully tackled.⁸² They must also stop the monopoly over knowledge by democratizing trade and ending the abuse of patent rules (for example, by Big Pharma over medicines) that drive inequality.

- Empower workers and communities. Corporations must pay living wages and commit to ensuring climate and gender justice: dividend payments and buybacks should be banned until this is guaranteed. Trade unions must be supported, protected and encouraged. CEO pay should be capped. Governments must introduce legally binding measures to guarantee the rights of women and racialized peoples, and to ensure mandatory human rights and environmental due diligence.
- Radically increase taxes on corporates and rich individuals. This includes a permanent wealth tax and a permanent excess profit tax. The G20, under Brazilian leadership, should champion a new international agreement to increase taxes on the income and wealth of the world's richest individuals.

3. Reinvent business

Governments can use their power to reinvent and repurpose the private sector. They must:

- Use all their power to create and promote a new generation of companies that do not put shareholders first – including worker and local cooperatives, social enterprises, and fair-trade businesses – that are owned and governed in the interest of workers, local communities, and the environment. Competitive and profitable businesses don't have to be shackled by shareholder greed.
- Provide financial support to equitable businesses. They can also use tax and other economic instruments such as public procurement to prioritize equitable business models. No economic aid or government contracts should be given to companies that are missing their net zero targets, paying below living wages, or dodging taxes.

Chapter 1

A GILDED AGE OF DIVISION



1. A GILDED AGE OF DIVISION

→ Jeff Bezos is one of the world's richest men. The company he founded, Amazon, is being sued by the US government for 'Illegally Maintaining Monopoly Power'.⁸³ His fortune of US\$167.4bn has increased by US\$32.7bn since 2020.⁸⁴ Bezos flew to space for US\$5.5bn and thanked Amazon workers for making this possible.⁸⁵ Amazon has an extensive history of making efforts to prevent unionizing by workers.⁸⁶

→ Reverend Ryan Brown works at an Amazon fulfillment center in North Carolina. He describes the work as physically demanding, monotonous and grueling, with workers subject to racism and discrimination. According

to Reverend Brown, 'We're living through a Gilded Age, where these people are getting so wealthy,' but 'none of that wealth is trickling down to the people who made it happen.' He is involved in workplace organizing to address racism and secure a living wage.⁸⁷

→ Seafood-processing workers in Southeast Asia have supplied food to supermarkets such as Amazon-owned Whole Foods and others.⁸⁸ Workers in this industry include Susi, who used to work at a shrimp factory. She said, 'While we were working there wasn't time to rest, I was not allowed to drink.' Dewi, another former worker, says her employer demanded pregnancy tests and that, 'If you got pregnant, you had to quit.'⁸⁹



Amazon employees campaign for better working conditions in Brandizzo, Italy. Photo by Nicolò Campo/LightRocket via Getty Images.


1.1 A brutal world for billions of people

For most people across the world, the years since 2020 have been incredibly hard. For the poorest people, who are more likely to be women, racialized peoples,⁹⁰ and marginalized groups in every society, daily life has been brutal. The 2020s, which started with COVID-19 and then saw escalating conflict, the acceleration of the climate crisis and surging costs of living, appears to be turning into a decade of division. Poverty in the poorest countries is still higher than it was in 2019.⁹¹ Worldwide, prices are outpacing pay,⁹² meaning hundreds of millions of people are struggling to make their earnings stretch further

each month. Protests, strikes and other action by workers have repeatedly made the news headlines as people strive to survive.⁹³

The sharp increase in the cost of food and other essentials that began in 2021 has become a grinding new reality for many families across the world as they try to buy oil, bread or flour without knowing how much they can afford this time, or how hungry they and their children will have to go today.

The gap between the Global North and the Global South has grown for the first time in 25 years.⁹⁴ Global inequality is now at a level comparable to the level of inequality found



within South Africa, the country with the highest inequality in the world.⁹⁵ Climate breakdown is further increasing global wealth inequality. One study found that inequality between nations is 25% higher than it would have been without the impact of climate breakdown.^{96, 97}

Governments are finding it impossible to stay financially afloat and face huge debts and escalating costs for importing fuel, food and medicines.⁹⁸ Low- and lower-middle income countries are set to pay nearly half a billion US dollars a day in interest and debt payments between now and 2029.⁹⁹ A recent Oxfam report highlights how Lebanon's debt ballooned by 151% in 2020 before it was forced to default.¹⁰⁰ This is driving a wave of austerity. More

than half (57%) of the world's poorest countries, home to 2.4 billion people, are having to cut public spending by a combined US\$229bn over the next five years: this is more than the total amount of official development assistance (ODA) in 2022.¹⁰¹ These cuts are often felt particularly acutely by women, girls and non-binary people, especially those who experience intersecting inequalities based on race, ethnicity and caste.¹⁰²

People are fighting back with huge strikes and protests across the world, from massive cost-of-living protests in Kenya¹⁰³ to Amazon workers striking in 30 countries across the world.¹⁰⁴ In 2022, cost-of-living protests occurred in 122 countries and territories;¹⁰⁵ these continued in 2023.¹⁰⁶

OF THE TEN BIGGEST CORPORATIONS IN THE WORLD, SEVEN EITHER HAVE A BILLIONAIRE CEO OR A BILLIONAIRE AS PRINCIPAL SHAREHOLDER.

THE TOTAL VALUE OF THESE COMPANIES IS \$10.2 TRILLION.



Box 1: Inequality in numbers

- Since 2020, the beginning of this decade of division, the world's five richest men have seen their fortunes more than double, while almost five billion people have seen their wealth fall.¹⁰⁷
- If each of the five wealthiest men globally were to spend a million US dollars daily, they would take 476 years to exhaust their combined wealth.¹⁰⁸
- Seven out of ten of the world's biggest corporations have a billionaire CEO or a billionaire as their principal shareholder.^{109, 110}
- Globally, men own US\$105 trillion more wealth than women – this difference in wealth is equivalent to more than four times the size of the US economy.¹¹¹
- The world's richest 1% own 59% of all global financial assets.¹¹²
- The world's richest 1% emit as much carbon pollution as the poorest two-thirds of humanity.¹¹³
- In the USA, the wealth of a typical Black household is just 15.8% of that of a typical white household.¹¹⁴ In Brazil, on average, white people have incomes more than 70% higher than those of Afro-descendants.¹¹⁵
- Just 0.4% of over 1,600 of the world's largest and most influential companies are publicly committed to paying their workers a living wage and support payment of a living wage in their value chains.¹¹⁶
- It would take 1,200 years for a female worker in the health and social sector to earn what a CEO in the biggest Fortune 100 companies earns on average in one year.¹¹⁷

1.2 A wonderful world for the few at the top

The richest people in our world remain the big winners at this time of crisis. In 2023, billionaires are US\$3.3 trillion or 34% richer than they were in 2020 at the beginning of this decade of division.¹¹⁸ The number of millionaires is projected to increase by 44% between now and 2027, while the number of people worth US\$50m and above is set to increase by 50%.¹¹⁹

Oxfam estimates that if the wealth of the five richest billionaires continues to rise at the same rate as it has over the last five years, we will see the first trillionaire in 10 years. However, we will not eliminate poverty for 230 years.¹²⁰

Only 21% of humanity lives in the countries of the Global North, but these countries are home to 69% of private wealth, and 74% of the world's billionaire wealth (see Box 2).¹²¹




Box 2: Colonialism revisited? Why most of the super-rich still live in Europe and the USA

Despite the economic ascent of China in the last two decades, the majority of the world's wealth and its super-rich individuals are still concentrated in the Global North.¹²² For Europe, this is very much a legacy of colonialism and empire. By one estimate, the UK extracted US\$45 trillion from India during the colonial period.¹²³ Since the formal end of colonialism, neocolonial relationships with the Global South persist, perpetuating economic imbalances and rigging the economic rules in favour of rich nations. The USA has particularly benefitted from its incredible global economic dominance, especially in the second half of the 20th century. Much of its wealth was born out of slavery and the systematic dispossession of Indigenous peoples.^{124, 125}

Multinational corporations, the focus of our paper in 2024, were invented in the colonial era and this helped facilitate this extraction of wealth from the Global South to the Global North.¹²⁶ The latest data from the UBS *Global Wealth Report 2023* and the Forbes list of the world's billionaires demonstrates that despite representing only 21% of the world population, countries in the Global North own 69% of global wealth and are home to 74% of the world's billionaire wealth.¹²⁷

FIGURE 1: RICH PEOPLE IN THE GLOBAL NORTH STILL OWN THE WORLD

Share of wealth concentration in the Global North compared to the rest of the world (%)



Source: Oxfam calculation based on data from Forbes billionaires list¹²⁸ and the UBS *Global Wealth Report 2023*.¹²⁹

Box 3: Inequality is too high – it’s time to target a rapid reduction

There is broad agreement that inequality is too high in almost every nation and globally.¹³⁰ In 2023, world-leading economists including Jayati Ghosh and Thomas Piketty came together with former UN, IMF and World Bank staff to call for clear targets to be set for inequality reduction.¹³¹ Oxfam supports the idea, proposed by Joseph Stiglitz,¹³² that every nation should aim for a situation in which inequality is reduced to the point where the bottom 40% of the population have around the same income as the richest 10%, known as a Palma of 1.¹³³

1.3 Corporate profits surge during this time of crisis

Global corporations and their super-rich owners are among the big winners amid this crisis. CEOs the world over have enjoyed significant pay rises in recent decades: CEO pay has risen by more than 1,200% at the 350 largest US


companies – vastly outstripping the meagre pay increases of workers.¹³⁴ Analysis by Oxfam and ActionAid of the world’s largest corporations found an 89% jump in profits for the years 2021 and 2022, compared to the 2017–2020 average.¹³⁵ New data covering the first six months of 2023,¹³⁶ reveals that 2023 is set to shatter all records as the most profitable year yet for big corporations. Together, 148 of the world’s biggest corporations that we have data for made nearly US\$1.8 trillion in profits in the 12 months leading up to June 2023.¹³⁷

The biggest winners in terms of windfall profits have been:¹³⁸

- The 14 oil and gas companies whose profits in 2023 were 278% above the 2018–21 average; these companies received US\$144bn in windfall profits in 2022 and US\$190bn in 2023.
- The profits of two luxury brands in 2023 were 120% above the average for 2018–21, representing US\$8.5bn and US\$9.9bn in windfall profits in 2022 and 2023.
- Twenty-two financial industry corporations increased their profits by 32% in 2023 compared to the average for 2018–21 and made windfall profits of US\$36bn in 2023.

FIGURE 2: CORPORATIONS CASH IN

Net profits compared with average net profits of 148 of the largest 200 corporations in US\$ billions



Source: The data used was provided to Oxfam by Exerica.¹³⁹

- Eleven pharmaceutical corporations increased their profits by nearly 32% in 2022 compared to the average for 2018–21 and made US\$41.3bn in windfall profits in 2022.

These profits are hugely concentrated in a few corporates: globally the largest 0.001% of firms earn roughly one-third of all corporate profits.¹⁴⁰

1.4 The link between corporate power and extreme wealth

The richest people are the biggest beneficiaries of the global economy; in some cases, they have benefitted from hundreds of years of colonialism, the legacy of which continues to this day.¹⁴¹ Racialized groups are less likely to own corporations. In the USA, 89% of shares are owned by white people, 1.1% by Black people and 0.5% by Hispanic people.¹⁴² In 2022 in South Africa, only 39% of companies listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange were controlled by Black people; 0% of entities were Black-owned.¹⁴³ Similarly, globally, only one in three businesses are owned by women.¹⁴⁴ Research on 5,727 African companies shows that chief executives of firms with female shareholders are more likely to be women. This data suggests that 'old boys' club' ownership structures can hamper the empowerment of female talent in corporations.¹⁴⁵

The super-rich are more likely to own corporations. In the USA, one of the very few countries for which there is regular data on the distribution of corporate equities, the richest 0.1% account for 19.8% of shares owned by households, the richest 1% own 44.6%, while the poorest 50% own just 1%.¹⁴⁶ New research on 24 OECD countries found that the richest 10% of households own 85% of total capital-ownership assets – including shares in companies, mutual funds and other businesses – while the bottom 40% own just 4%.¹⁴⁷ Similarly, in South Africa, the richest 1% own more than 95% of bonds and corporate shares, while the richest 0.01% own 62.7%.¹⁴⁸ In Brazil, the richest 0.01% own 27% of financial assets, the richest 0.1% own 43%, and the richest 1% own 63%, while the poorest 50% own just 2%.¹⁴⁹ It is clear that ownership of stocks and shares reflects an economic plutocracy rather than an economic democracy.

New research by Oxfam provides deeply concerning answers to the question of how much of the world's financial assets are owned by the 1%. Using data from Wealth X, we have found that the richest 1% own 59% of all global financial assets.¹⁵⁰ In the Middle East, the richest 1% hold 72% of financial wealth; in Asia, the richest 1% own 58% of wealth; and in Europe, the richest 1% own 56% of wealth. Looking beyond the richest 1% to all billionaires globally: in 2022, the richest 50 US billionaires held 75% of their wealth in equity in the corporations they head.¹⁵¹ Warren Buffet – Board Chair, CEO and the largest shareholder in Berkshire Hathaway – holds 99% of his wealth in his company's stock. Mark Zuckerberg, who controls Meta, holds 95% of his wealth in company stock; Jeff Bezos, no longer CEO but still Board Chair at Amazon, holds 83% of his wealth in Amazon equity, and a very powerful 10% stake in the company as a whole.¹⁵²

Oxfam also analysed the ownership structure of the world's 50 biggest public corporations.¹⁵³ We identified which of these corporations has a billionaire either as the CEO or the principal shareholder. Of the 50 largest listed companies in the world, 17 (34%) have a billionaire as either a principal shareholder or a CEO. The total value (market capitalization) of these companies is US\$13.3 trillion. Of the 10 largest listed companies in the world, seven have a billionaire as either a principal shareholder or CEO. A principal shareholder's voting shares allow the shareholder to vote on who should be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or who should sit on the company's board of directors.

Many corporates have billionaires with ownership stakes of above 50%, giving the owners a controlling stake.¹⁵⁴ This includes the Walton family, the richest family in the USA, who own around 50% of Walmart, one of the world's largest retailers.¹⁵⁵ It also includes the billionaire Robert Kuok, the richest man in Malaysia, whose family controls 51% of conglomerate PPB Group, with interests ranging from agriculture to property.¹⁵⁶

This evidence shows that the world's super-rich are not just passive beneficiaries of huge corporate profits. The fact that they own corporations gives them the power to actively control and hence shape the way that they behave, including how they drive the divide between their

rich owners and the rest of society.¹⁵⁷ This can include the way that these corporations, in turn, influence states and laws in many different sectors and contexts.¹⁵⁸

The very wealthiest also directly shape economies in their favour by influencing public policy and laws.¹⁵⁹ More than 11% of the world's billionaires have either run for office or become politicians.¹⁶⁰ A study on the policy preferences of about 3,000 policy proposals from thirty European countries over forty years shows that proposals supported by the rich were more likely to be implemented than those supported by the poor.¹⁶¹

The power and influence of the super-rich has enabled them to drive down the share of the economy that goes to the many, and exponentially increased the share received

by the few owners of capital, who are predominantly the richest in every society.

The rest of this report focuses on corporate power and the close relationship between the explosion in corporate power and the growth in global inequality. Chapter 2 explores the role of market concentration and monopolies in promoting corporate power and inequality. Chapter 3 examines three ways in which corporate power is used to drive inequality: by squeezing workers and enriching wealthy shareholders, dodging taxes, and privatizing the state. It also shows how corporate power is hastening climate breakdown, thereby exploiting and magnifying economic, gender and racial inequalities. Chapter 4 provides recommendations on how to address corporate power and build more equal societies.



Corporate buildings. Photo by 4045/Shutterstock.

Chapter 2

A NEW ERA OF MONOPOLY POWER



2. A NEW ERA OF MONOPOLY POWER

This chapter explores a key instrument that has fuelled inequality – corporate concentration and the growth of global monopoly power. Billionaire tycoons and powerful financial firms dominate the ownership of corporate monopolies, which in turn dominate more and more of our economies, transferring and concentrating extraordinary wealth and power in the hands of an ultra-wealthy few.

2.1 Monopolies fuel inequality

We are living through a new era of monopoly power.¹⁶² A small number of ever-swelling corporations wield extraordinary influence over economies and governments,¹⁶³ with – as this paper shows – largely unbridled power to price gouge consumers; suppress wages and abuse workers; limit access to critical goods and services; thwart innovation and entrepreneurship; and privatize public services and utilities for private profit.

Monopolistic corporations are not just large; they can control markets, set the rules and terms of exchange with other companies and workers, and set higher prices without losing business.¹⁶⁴ Specifically, a monopoly is ‘a firm with significant and durable market power – that is, the long-term ability to raise price or exclude competitors’.¹⁶⁵ Monopolistic power begets more power, allowing monopolies to extract from firms and workers in their gravitational orbit, driving greater inequality.¹⁶⁶

Bodies such as the IMF agree that monopolistic power is growing and contributing to inequality.¹⁶⁷ Monopolies drive an economy-wide transfer from labour to capital – redistributing ‘the disposable income of the many into capital gains, dividends and executive compensation of the few’.¹⁶⁸ By creating scarcity to increase prices to drive profits up, monopolies redistribute income and wealth regressively economy-wide: from workers and consumers, who are overcharged and overburdened by higher margins, to executives and owners, who are more likely to be rich and own stock.

IMF research found that the rise in monopoly power accounts for 76% of the decline in the labour income

share in manufacturing in the USA; without it, labour income share would have stayed constant in the 20th century.¹⁶⁹ Optimistically, research shows that anti-monopoly enforcement reverses these trends – lowering prices, increasing new business formation, and raising wages and employment for workers.¹⁷⁰ Just as monopoly pricing punishes poorer people, the savings from tackling monopolies disproportionately accrues to them.¹⁷¹

Private monopolies are not an abstract phenomenon; they have a huge role in shaping the lives of ordinary people around the world – influencing how much we are paid, the foods we eat and can afford, which medicines we can access, and which human rights are realized (or violated). Driven by concern with their profits rather than national or public concern, all too often multinational monopolies use their power to invade privacy and distort public discourse.^{172, 173} They have also been shown to weaponize racism in the USA.¹⁷⁴ Access-to-medicines advocates, for example, criticized the ‘scientific racism’ deployed to undermine the sharing of science and technologies for COVID-19 vaccines with manufacturers in low- and middle-income countries.¹⁷⁵



THE WORLD'S FIVE LARGEST CORPORATIONS
COMBINED ARE VALUED AT MORE THAN ALL
THE GDPs OF AFRICA, LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

2.2 Peak monopoly power

Governments have enabled the world's largest corporations to get bigger and more profitable. Apple is valued at US\$3 trillion: illustratively, this figure is greater than the entire GDP of France, the seventh-biggest country economy in the world.¹⁷⁶ The world's five largest corporations combined are valued at more than the combined GDP of all economies in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean.¹⁷⁷ And while huge corporate power is a global story, it is not surprising that US corporations often dominate discourse about corporate power, given that they make up most of the world's most valuable companies.¹⁷⁸

Monopolistic firms have come under scrutiny for 'sellers' inflation' since 2021.¹⁷⁹ As supply shocks from COVID-19 rocked the global economy, large firms in many concentrated sectors, implicitly coordinating, were able to

increase prices to drive up their margins – in turn driving inflation, a theory validated by the IMF and the European Central Bank.¹⁸⁰ Energy, food and pharma sectors saw significant price hikes, enabling corporations to increase profits at the fastest pace since 1955.¹⁸¹


Such opportunistic intensity of price-hiking is new; the trend of increasing profits is not. Data from over 70,000 companies in 134 countries over four decades shows that the global average markup – the ratio of price to cost – rose from 7% above costs in 1980 to 59% above costs in 2020. Crucially, this increase has been driven by dominant firms at the top, worldwide, which have seen their market power grow, and not the majority of firms.¹⁸² Moreover, rising profits have been driven by large multinational corporations: the share of multinational profits in global profits quadrupled from 4% in 1975 to 18% in 2019 – with this rise most pronounced in the 21st century (see Figure 3).¹⁸³



Stéphane Bancel, Moderna CEO, called to testify before the United States Congress on COVID-19 vaccine pricing. Photo by Chip Somodevilla/Getty Images.

FIGURE 3: THE REMARKABLE PROFIT GRAB BY HUGE MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

Corporate and multinational profits between 1975–2019



Source: L. Wier and G. Zucman. (2022). 'Global profit shifting', UNU WIDER Working Paper.¹⁸⁴

Price inflation is just one manifestation of market power. Simultaneously, the relative size of huge corporations has mushroomed.¹⁸⁵ Amazon, which was sued by the US government in late 2023, is accused of using its monopoly power to 'inflate prices, degrade quality, and stifle innovation for consumers and businesses'.¹⁸⁶

2.3 Big Pharma, Big Tech, big everything

Market concentration is everywhere. Globally, corporations have undergone major consolidation:

- Ten giant, global 'Big Pharma' firms merged from 60 companies over two decades.¹⁸⁷
- Two global companies control over 40% of the global seed market¹⁸⁸ (compared with 10 companies owning 40% of the global seed market 25 years ago).¹⁸⁹
- Four firms control 62% of the world's pesticide market.¹⁹⁰
- Three-quarters of global online advertisement spending pays Meta, Alphabet and Amazon.¹⁹¹
- More than 90% of online search is done via Google.¹⁹²
- The 'Big Four' companies dominate the global accounting market, holding a 74% market share.¹⁹³

- Agriculture has seen 'increasing concentration in the production and trading of agriculture and food products'.¹⁹⁴

Numerous seemingly unique products on supermarket shelves, from cereal to shampoo, are in fact owned by the same corporation.¹⁹⁵ For example, beer giant Anheuser-Busch Inbev owns over 500 brands of beer, including Budweiser, Becks, Corona and Stella Artois.¹⁹⁶

Monopoly power is increased and exercised through many business tactics, including: mergers and acquisitions; collusion in concentrated industries; aggressive abuse of intellectual property protection; and exclusive dealing to push rivals and smaller businesses out of the market.

Venture capitalists and monopolies use their preferential access to finance to help monopolistic companies while starving their competitors, then capture higher returns from surviving firms.¹⁹⁷ Economies across the Global South are locked into exporting primary commodities, from copper to coffee, for use by monopolistic industries in the Global North, perpetuating a colonial-style 'extractivist' model.¹⁹⁸

Box 4: Modern monopoly men

Monopolies and billionaires are two sides of the same coin. Billionaires are much more common in sectors with high levels of cronyism and monopoly power, as the following examples demonstrate.¹⁹⁹



1. BERNARD ARNAULT

Bernard Arnault (net worth: US\$191.3bn) is the world's second richest man and presides over Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton (LVMH), the world's largest luxury goods empire, which holds a reported 22% of the global luxury market.²⁰⁰ Mr Arnault not only collects exclusive properties on the Champs-Élysées,²⁰¹ but media houses too, including France's biggest media outlet, Les Echos, and *Le Parisien*, a newspaper widely read by the working classes. LVMH has been fined by France's anti-trust body for anti-competitive practices.²⁰²



2. JEFF BEZOS

Jeff Bezos (net worth: US\$167.4bn) built the Amazon 'empire' – that now spans from producing television series to being the world's largest provider of computing services – by positioning the company at the 'center of ecommerce' and cultivating reliance on Amazon across markets, using its scale to set pricing.²⁰³



3. ALIKO DANGOTE

Aliko Dangote (net worth: US\$10.5bn) is Africa's richest person and holds a 'near-monopoly' on cement in Nigeria and market power Africa-wide.²⁰⁴ Dangote Cement has enjoyed some of the world's highest profit margins on cement (45%), while paying a tax rate of 1% over 15 years.²⁰⁵ World Bank data has in the past shown that Africans pay more than others worldwide for cement.²⁰⁶ Dangote is now expanding his empire into oil, raising concerns about a new private monopoly.²⁰⁷




4. JULIO PONCE LEROU

Julio Ponce Lerou (net worth: US\$2.5bn), Chile's second richest man and the former son-in-law of Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet, is described as the 'Lithium King' due to his ownership stake in SQM, the world's second largest lithium-mining firm.²⁰⁸ SQM was privatized by Pinochet in the 1980s. The Chilean government plans to bring lithium under greater state control.²⁰⁹



5. MASAYOSHI SON

Masayoshi Son (net worth: US\$22.5bn) runs Japanese investment giant Softbank, which has been described as a 'monopoly manufacturing machine'. Firms under its ownership include Arm, which holds a 99% market share on designs of chips found in smartphones.²¹⁰



Box 5: Big Pharma and patents

Big Pharma monopolies aggressively purchase their competitors and enforce intellectual property rules, despite innovation being largely driven by public funding (in the USA, for example, every new approved drug was contributed to by public money between 2010–19).²¹¹ This model prioritizes highly profitable drugs, harming access, and neglecting vaccines, treatments and tests needed by people in poorer nations.

Gilead, for example, purchased Sofosbuvir, a drug used to treat Hepatitis C (and developed with significant public money from the National Institutes of Health),²¹² then tripled its price to US\$100,000 per patient, putting it virtually out of reach of those who need it most.²¹³ In a most palpable and deadly form of monopoly power, at least 1.3 million more lives could have been saved had there been greater access to COVID-19 vaccines during the pandemic: lower-income countries, in particular, could have experienced lower death rates as a result.²¹⁴ While public funding was vital to creating these vaccines, they were monopolized by Big Pharma and aggressively protected by global trade rules – manifesting a neocolonial outcome of monopoly power and depriving Global South nations of the vaccines available in rich nations.²¹⁵

2.4 Monopoly money

Private finance and asset managers – acting largely on behalf of wealthy clients – play a huge role in concentrating economic power in fewer hands.²¹⁶ Private equity firms, backed globally by US\$5.8 trillion of rich investors' cash since 2009, have used privileged financial access to consolidate many markets by 'rolling-up' small businesses. This fuels their own profits and those of the companies they buy, while distorting markets and acting as a monopolizing force across sectors.²¹⁷

Beyond private equity, the 'Big Three' index fund managers – BlackRock, State Street and Vanguard – together manage some US\$20 trillion in assets.²¹⁸ Research suggests that this kind of market concentration reduces incentives for companies to compete and in turn deepens monopoly power.²¹⁹ Together they control close to one-fifth of all investable assets in the world.²²⁰ Common ownership in so few financial firms undermines fairness across the economy.²²¹ Further to this, Harvard research has argued that the economic power held by such index funds is so concentrated that 'in the near future roughly twelve individuals will have practical power over the majority of U.S. public companies', concerns that were previously echoed by the founder of Vanguard himself.²²²

This financialization of corporations, which sees enormous financial markets play an ever-increasing role in the economy, has exacerbated the focus on short-term profits over any longer-term goals.²²³ It has also directed investment away from productive uses, instead acting in the interest of extreme capital by reorientating many non-financial businesses increasingly towards financial instruments and activities.²²⁴ This approach is exemplified by the model of many hedge funds, which is to identify and buy an undervalued company, sell off assets and fire staff to make a short-term profit before moving on to their next target. Hedge funds operate on behalf of rich investors; the minimum investment in hedge funds begins at around US\$100,000 to upwards of US\$2m.²²⁵

When large corporations take steps toward mission-oriented, purposeful goals, such as focusing on paying living wages or acting to reduce their carbon footprints, they can be aggressively attacked for doing so. Hedge

funds have been shown to treat efforts by companies to act more sustainably as a sign that they are wasting resources and not maximizing shareholder value.²²⁶ These companies become a target for hedge funds' 'buy, strip and flip' strategy.²²⁷ This is demonstrated by Kraft Heinz's £11.5bn hostile bid for the consumer company Unilever in 2017, backed by Brazilian hedge fund 3G Capital.²²⁸

The Global North dominates the private capital market; of the nearly US\$10 trillion in global assets under management, 56% are domiciled in North America, 24% in Europe and 18% in Asia.²²⁹ A lot of these funds are, however, channelled towards the Global South. By some estimates, private capital inflows are now as large as ODA as a share of GDP for low-income countries (LICs), but some of these investments are highly volatile and have not promoted inclusive economic growth.²³⁰ Research on sub-Saharan Africa indicates that private equity investments are skewed towards the finance and ICT sectors and 83% of investments went to only four countries.²³¹ Similarly, research from 31 Global South countries suggests much of the financial income is earned by the largest firms, empowering local economic elites who benefit from financial integration.²³² The growth of a large and unaccountable sector creates new challenges for national sovereignty.²³³

2.5 Learning lessons from the past

Monopolies are not new. Founded in 1600, the English East India Company grew into the world's largest monopoly, violently ushering in a colonial era.²³⁴ In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, notably in the USA, a so-called 'Gilded Age' saw some businessmen grow extraordinarily rich, monopolizing industries from railways to banking.²³⁵ This is typified by John D. Rockefeller's oil empire or Cecil Rhodes controlling the global diamond supply.²³⁶

The last time wealth concentration was this high, governments took on private monopolies through an expansion of public power in countries such as the USA.²³⁷ They broke up monopolies and repressed their power by subjecting them to new competition and anti-trust policies, alongside new financial regulations and taxes. At the same time, they increased public power, turning some industries into public utilities, and with industries

from electricity to healthcare (for example, the National Health Service in the UK) becoming publicly owned and delivered.²³⁸

However, this period of assertive public policy that began in the early 20th century ended by the late 1970s, as neoliberal economics supplanted government regulation in favour of the unfettered market.²³⁹ Anti-monopoly policies were dramatically weakened and redesigned around a 'consumer welfare standard'. This is a pro-monopoly paradigm that tends to assume that large companies are more efficient and deliver better value for consumers. This view is that as long as consumer prices are low, other concerns such as size, power, fairness and democracy are not important. Yet even if this deeply flawed approach is taken at face value, it has failed on its own terms: the consolidation of markets has predictably led to higher prices for consumers.²⁴⁰ This central, if lesser-known, part of the neoliberal story has unleashed capital in the service of monopoly power.²⁴¹

A further central element of the story of corporate monopolies driving inequality globally – historically, and today – is that of the 'unequal exchange' that in part results from rich nations and their monopolistic corporations asserting their dominance in the global economy. This includes lowering the prices of natural resources and labour in Global South countries and through the aggressive assertion of patent monopolies, in turn enabled by power imbalances in global financial rules and institutions.²⁴²

2.6 From democracy to plutocracy

Extreme power inequality created by private monopolies is a form of corruption that charges economic inequality.²⁴³

Monopolies act like governments, regulate like governments and compete with governments for power.²⁴⁴ As former US President Franklin D. Roosevelt warned, 'the liberty of a democracy is not safe if the people tolerate the growth of private power to a point where it becomes stronger than their democratic state itself.'²⁴⁵ The risks of the growing power of corporations were notably signalled by former Chilean President Salvador Allende, who said, 'We are faced by a direct confrontation between the large transnational corporations and the states. The corporations are interfering in the fundamental political, economic and military decisions of the states.'²⁴⁶

As Chapter 3 will show, corporations have long invested in their power through armies of lobbyists – bringing them significant returns. But we know that monopoly is power itself – the power to snatch political decisions away from the democratic sphere. As billionaire Mark Zuckerberg noted, 'in a lot of ways Facebook is more like a government than a traditional company.'²⁴⁷

This new monopoly era is not inevitable or a natural phenomenon, but a result of law and public policy choices. It is in part a challenge of woefully weak competition, but more fundamentally one of concentrated private wealth and power that is not counterbalanced by public and democratic control.

The age of monopoly power requires us to take on the monopolists, to end today's extreme wealth concentration and claw back democracy. We must break up private monopolies and prevent corporations from becoming too large in the first place; end the monopoly over knowledge and democratize intellectual property; stop the privatization of public utilities; and revive greater public control.

Chapter 3

HOW CORPORATE POWER FUELS INEQUALITY



3. HOW CORPORATE POWER FUELS INEQUALITY

This chapter looks at four ways that an increasingly small number of increasingly powerful corporates are driving inequality: through squeezing workers while rewarding the wealthy, dodging tax, privatizing the state, and spurring climate breakdown.

3.1 Rewarding the wealthy, not the workers

Recent decades have been brutal for many of the world's workers. They have been characterized by a global race to the bottom and work that is too often underpaid, insecure and dangerous. This chapter describes how people in global value chains, especially women and racialized people, are paid poverty wages, face widespread violations of their rights, and endure abysmal working conditions while companies use their influence to secure corporate-friendly labour policies. These dire circumstances have generated unprecedented profits for major companies, fantastic pay for an elite class of executives and tremendous wealth for shareholders. Rather than investing in higher wages and better working conditions – such as policies that would more effectively support care responsibilities – powerful corporations have chosen to enrich their owners, a group that, as this report shows, is disproportionately ultra-rich and from the Global North.

3.1.1 A worsening situation for the world's workers

Workers worldwide are carrying out poorly compensated, backbreaking, and often unsafe labour for the benefit of some of the world's largest corporations. Wages are the primary means by which the benefits of productivity, and thus economic growth, reach workers – yet for decades, wage growth has fallen alarmingly behind in many countries.²⁴⁸ Analysis by the ILO reveals that the gap between wage growth and labour productivity in 52 countries in 2022 is at its widest since the beginning of the 21st century.²⁴⁹ New Oxfam analysis of the World Benchmarking Alliance's data on over 1,600 of the largest and most influential companies worldwide shows that a mere 0.4% of companies are publicly committed to paying their workers a living wage and support payment of a living wage in their value chains.²⁵⁰

Low wages mean that many workers toil long hours and are trapped in poverty,²⁵¹ while persistent gender wage gaps and heavy unpaid care loads (discussed in Section 3.1.4) reflect a global economy that rests on the systematic exploitation of women. Corporations have benefitted massively from circumventing the costs and obligations associated with employees by relying on non-standard forms of employment such as contracting, outsourcing, and temporary and part-time work. For workers, these types of work are often characterized by precarity and informality, lower wages, lack of access to social protection, little security, less bargaining power, and a lack of basic rights.²⁵² In recent years, such roles have proliferated in countries where they previously did not.²⁵³

For far too many people, work is dangerous and even deadly. According to the ILO, 2.3 million workers die every year because of occupational accidents or work-related diseases,²⁵⁴ and 17.3 million people are in forced labour in the private sector, the majority of them working in domestic and global supply chains.²⁵⁵

Organized labour can provide an important counterbalance to corporate power.²⁵⁶ Trade unions and collective bargaining have historically helped increase workers' wages, protections and rights,²⁵⁷ and are associated with lower income inequality.²⁵⁸ However, according to the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) in 2023, the past 10 years have witnessed 'a consistent increase in the violation of workers' rights across regions', including widespread violations of the right to collective bargaining, as well as violence against and even the murder of trade unionists and workers.²⁵⁹

While recent high-profile strikes and unionization efforts have rightly made news headlines and achieved wins for workers, trade union membership has fallen in the preceding decades, drastically in some countries.²⁶⁰ Some of the world's richest corporations and their suppliers have allegedly used union-busting tactics in the Global South and the Global North.²⁶¹ In OECD countries, 30% of workers were members of a union in 1985; that number had dropped to 17% by 2017.²⁶² Oxfam's analysis of the World Benchmarking Alliance's data of over 1,600 of the world's largest companies finds that only 0.7% fully meet a

global bar for collective bargaining, meaning they disclose collective bargaining coverage in their workforce and their approach to supporting collective bargaining through their business relationships (e.g. their suppliers).²⁶³

3.1.2 Corporate influence over labour policy and laws

Powerful corporations have also used their resources and access to seek favourable labour laws and policies that maintain an unequal status quo. For example, journalists and civil society have documented how some companies have allegedly used trade associations, ‘revolving doors’ between public policymaking and the private sector, public relations campaigns, research and lobbying in an attempt to secure or defend labour regulations that minimize their obligations to workers.²⁶⁴ Corporate lobbying has been linked to political restrictions on unionization,²⁶⁵ opposition to restrictions on forced labour,²⁶⁶ fighting minimum wage increases,²⁶⁷ rollbacks to child labour laws,²⁶⁸ reforms that undermine workers’ rights,²⁶⁹ and efforts to weaken rules that protect workers’ health and safety.²⁷⁰ For example, EU corporate lobbyists have reportedly sought to increase market access for pesticides in Brazil, despite clear risks to agricultural workers.²⁷¹

3.1.3 Funneling record profits to the wealthy

Corporate power has been a major driver of value away from the majority towards the ultra-wealthy few. As shown in Chapter 1, the world’s largest companies have enjoyed unprecedented windfall profits in recent years, many of which have been handed to their shareholders through dividends or share repurchases (i.e. buybacks). New analysis by Oxfam and ActionAid reveals the extent to which corporations have funnelled record profits to shareholders through these payouts.

Our findings show that for every US\$100 of profit generated by 96 major companies between July 2022 and June 2023, US\$82 was returned to shareholders in the form of stock buybacks and dividends.²⁷² Such massive payouts disproportionately benefit the wealthy because share ownership is highly skewed towards them. These payouts also represent resources that could otherwise have been invested in workers (e.g. by raising wages), or in new ways of operating that could reduce carbon emissions.²⁷³

For example, on the back of high oil and gas prices, Shell made US\$29.2bn in profits between July 2022 and June 2023, an increase of 222% compared to its average profits from 2018–21.²⁷⁴ Of those profits, 87.7% were handed back to shareholders in the form of stock buybacks and dividends. Between July 2022 and June 2023, Brazil’s Petrobras made US\$30.3bn in profits – almost four times more than its average annual profits from 2019–21.²⁷⁵ It paid out more than 100% of these profits (118%) to shareholders in the form of dividends – more than three times what Petrobras invested in capital expenditure.²⁷⁶

Box 6: A choice – end poverty or enrich wealthy shareholders?

Oxfam estimates that if the amount companies spent on dividends and shareholder buybacks for the richest 10% in 2022 was redistributed to the bottom 40% of the income distribution, global income inequality as measured by the Palma ratio could decrease by 21.5% – equivalent to the actual drop in the Palma ratio observed over 41 years.²⁷⁷ Moreover, just half of the amount from payouts to the top 10% in 2022 could reduce global poverty (defined as US\$6.85 a day, 2017 PPP), and a mere 1.6% of the payouts could eliminate extreme poverty as defined by the World Bank (US\$2.15 a day, 2017 PPP).²⁷⁸

3.1.4 The unequal world of work

As a result of deteriorating working conditions and rights, corporate influence over labour policy, and the diversion of record profits to wealthy shareholders, instead of work serving as a path to shared prosperity, in many ways it is turbocharging inequality. According to ILO estimates, before the pandemic just over a fifth of the world’s workers were moderately or extremely poor,²⁷⁹ and 327 million wage earners earned just the minimum hourly wage or less.²⁸⁰ The situation has in many ways worsened, with the pandemic, war and inflation contributing to a global cost-of-living crisis.²⁸¹


Declining real wages now pose an immense threat to the living standards of workers and their families, especially those who were already low-paid.²⁸² In 2022, the ILO warned that the historic decline in real wages could increase inequality and fuel social unrest.²⁸³ Our own analysis for this report finds that 791 million workers have seen their wages fail to keep up with inflation and have lost US\$1.5 trillion over the last two years, equivalent to nearly a month (25 days) of lost wages for each worker.²⁸⁴ In 2022, the World Inequality Lab found that the poorest half of the world’s population earned just 8.5% of global income.²⁸⁵ In many countries, the poorest 40% of households command just a small fraction of the overall income, for example in Mexico (5%), Namibia (2.5%), Indonesia (3.6%) and Romania (10.4%).²⁸⁶

Racialized peoples are often exploited by supply chains,²⁸⁷ while white people disproportionately benefit from corporate profits.²⁸⁸ In the USA, white Americans (59% of the country’s population) own 89% of corporate shares, while Black and Hispanic families (14% and 19% of the population, respectively) own 1.1% and 0.5% respectively of corporate shares.²⁸⁹ Other countries in both the Global South and North show a similarly skewed distribution of shareholders.²⁹⁰

Migrant workers in global supply chains face systematic abuse and exploitation, including discriminatory laws, vulnerability to exploitation due to immigration status, isolation, exclusion from services, and woefully inadequate enforcement of labour protections.²⁹¹ Oxfam research in the food and garment sectors has demonstrated how Global North brands have been linked to and, at times, directly carried out, highly exploitative labour and environmental practices in Global South countries.²⁹²

Women are vastly overrepresented in the poorest-paid and least secure jobs,²⁹³ and face a persistently high gender pay gap.²⁹⁴ Gender inequality is exacerbated by supply chain strategies that undervalue much of the work done by women.²⁹⁵ This inequality is compounded by other forms of discrimination, such as that based on race and migration status; for example, migrant women workers in particular can be found doing jobs with low pay and very poor protection (see Box 7).²⁹⁶ In 2019, women earned just 51 cents for every US\$1 in labour income earned by men.²⁹⁷ Women also

suffered harsher economic impacts from the pandemic and collectively lost US\$800bn in earnings in 2020.²⁹⁸ Their share of estimated earnings in 2022, just 35% of total income globally, was only slightly more than the estimated 30% in 1990.²⁹⁹ New data on over 1,600 of the largest and most



FOR EVERY US\$100 OF PROFIT
GENERATED BY 96 MAJOR COMPANIES BETWEEN
JULY 2022 AND JUNE 2023,
US\$82 WAS RETURNED TO SHAREHOLDERS
IN THE FORM OF STOCK BUYBACKS AND DIVIDENDS



OUT OF MORE THAN 1,600 OF THE LARGEST
COMPANIES IN THE WORLD,
**ONLY 24% HAVE A PUBLIC
COMMITMENT TO GENDER EQUALITY**

influential companies reveals that only 24% have a public commitment to gender equality. Just 2.6% of companies disclose information on the ratio of pay of women to men.³⁰⁰

Women's disproportionate unpaid and underpaid care and domestic work props up corporate profits, with women and girls effectively subsidizing the economy by doing more than three-quarters of the unpaid care work worldwide.³⁰¹ For example, in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, women spend on average 17–34 hours per week on unpaid care, compared to men's 1–5 hours.³⁰² In 2020, Oxfam estimated that the monetary value of unpaid care work carried out by women globally is at least US\$10.8 trillion³⁰³ annually – three times the size of the global tech industry.³⁰⁴



WOMEN'S UNPAID CARE WORK
SUBSIDIZES THE ECONOMY BY AT LEAST
US\$10.8 TRILLION ANNUALLY

THIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE ECONOMY IS
THREE TIMES THE SIZE
OF THE GLOBAL TECH INDUSTRY



Box 7: Profiting from gendered exploitation in agri-food chains

Agri-food chains worldwide are rife with violations of women's rights and characterized by systemic exploitation and abuse with strongly gendered dimensions.³⁰⁵ Giant corporations with outsized control often engage in purchasing practices that place immense downward pressure on wages and contribute to insecure and informal work, while extracting much of the value from food and agricultural supply chains.³⁰⁶ The informal, temporary and other non-standard forms of work in these supply chains also create power differentials that contribute to gender-based violence which is widespread in the commercial agricultural sector.³⁰⁷

In 2021, Oxfam and partner organizations interviewed migrant women in Costa Rica and South Africa working on farms supplying fruit and wine to European supermarkets.³⁰⁸ They found that while the supermarkets were making record profits, the women workers faced inhumane conditions, serious rights violations and extremely low pay.

Women farm workers in South Africa received an estimated 1.2% of the sales price of a bottle of wine on average, while supermarkets received more than 50%.³⁰⁹ The workers interviewed, who were immigrants from other parts of the continent, described the exploitation and abuse they routinely experienced, including poor pay, exposure to pesticides, and lack of access to toilets or drinking water. The women also spoke of the precarity and discrimination they faced as immigrants with irregular legal status, at constant risk of deportation. One worker, Ruth, reported that the farm owner would shout at them: 'If you don't want to work, go back home.' Another, Tarisai, recalled the challenge of being denied access to unemployment support offered only to South Africans during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic: 'It was tough. We really suffered... We will never forget that time.'

3.2 Dodging taxes

Corporations and their wealthy owners also drive inequality by undertaking a sustained and highly effective war on taxation, enriching shareholders and depriving the public of critical resources.


3.2.1 The collapse of taxes on corporations and their owners

Corporate taxation has in many ways collapsed, despite sharply rising profits for many companies. Since 1980, the corporate income tax rate has more than halved in OECD countries, starting in 1980 at 48% and dropping to just 23.1% in 2022.³¹⁰ This collapse has occurred across the world, with statutory corporate income tax rates falling in 111 out of 141 countries surveyed between 2020 and 2023 (see Figure 4).³¹¹

As drastic as the fall in the statutory corporate tax rate has been, it doesn't begin to reveal the full extent of the problem, with tax havens, widespread use of wasteful tax incentives, and aggressive tax planning resulting in actual tax rates that are much lower than the statutory ones, and often closer to zero.³¹² Globally, the actual corporate tax rate dropped from 23% to 17% between 1975 and 2019 – a decline of roughly a third.³¹³ During the same period, many corporations made record profits.³¹⁴ According to the best available estimates, about US\$1 trillion in profits – 35% of foreign profits – were shifted to tax havens in 2022.³¹⁵ Just 4% of the more than 1,600 largest and most influential companies sampled worldwide fully meet the World Benchmarking Alliance's social indicator on responsible tax, by having a public global tax strategy and publicly disclosing corporate income taxes paid in all countries of residency.³¹⁶

FIGURE 4: CORPORATE TAX RATES HAVE FALLEN AROUND THE WORLD

Average statutory corporate income tax rates by region 2000–2023



Source: OECD Corporate Tax Statistics 2023.³¹⁷

The collapse of taxes on corporations has occurred alongside very low taxation of the types of income corporations pay out to their shareholders. In OECD countries, the average top marginal tax rate for dividend income declined sharply since 1980, from 61% to 42%, and in some countries, such as Brazil, it is not taxed at all.³¹⁸ Further, the income received from selling shares in corporations is taxed on average at just 18% across 123 countries, far lower than the top tax rates on income from labour (around 31% in the world's largest economies). Such income, called capital gains, is the most important source of income for the top 1% in many countries, and yet in one in five countries it's not taxed at all.

There is new momentum behind efforts to improve the global tax rules. In 2021, more than 140 countries agreed under the OECD base erosion and profit shifting (BEPS) Inclusive Framework to a two-pillar set of measures, with a global minimum effective corporate tax at 15%.³¹⁹ While promoted as an effort to end the race to the bottom and profit shifting, this G20/OECD-led process has fallen well short of what is needed, with concerns about inadequate representation of Global South countries' interests, the undermining of an already very low 15% rate by loopholes, and an approach that privileges rich countries and tax havens.³²⁰ Initiated by African countries and with the support of a broad range of civil society groups including Oxfam, in November 2023, the majority of UN member states voted to move forward with starting negotiations for an international framework tax convention at the UN – though a number of rich countries from the Global North shamefully voted against the step.³²¹ This is an opportunity to set fair global tax rules in the future where all countries would participate on equal footing.

3.2.2 Corporate influence over tax policy

Tax cuts for corporations and their owners were never driven by popular demand.³²² The collapse of taxes on corporations and their owners in recent decades is in part a result of a broader neoliberal agenda promoted by

corporations and their wealthy owners, often alongside Global North countries and international institutions such as the World Bank. Around the world, members of the private sector have relentlessly pushed for lower rates, more loopholes, less transparency, and other measures aimed at enabling companies to contribute as little as possible to public coffers.³²³ Corporations and corporate tax advisors are able to use their unjustifiably disproportionate influence over tax policymaking to achieve lower corporate taxes and other tax advantages.³²⁴ This approach is highly effective: one study from the USA found that a 1% increase in federal lobbying expenditure appeared to lower companies' effective tax rates by 0.5–1.6% on average, while another found that every US\$1 spent on lobbying related to a tax holiday had a return of over US\$220.³²⁵


3.2.3 Corporate tax cuts are tax cuts for the rich

As corporate taxation has collapsed and corporate profits have soared, those at the top have done fabulously. In high-income countries, falling rates of tax on corporations have coincided with a period in which a rising share of income is going to the top 1%.³²⁶ Evidence shows that corporate taxes are progressive and they are borne disproportionately by the richest people.³²⁷ This means the collapse in corporate tax in recent decades has essentially provided another huge tax cut for the richest people in the world. The economists Emmanuel Saez and Gabriel Zucman have shown, for example, that the massive fall in tax rates by the richest individuals in the USA is significantly driven by cuts to corporate taxes (Figure 5).³²⁸

While some have argued that cuts to corporate taxes will spur investment or drive growth that will 'trickle down,' there is a wide range of research that refutes the notion that tax cuts for big corporations are major drivers of investment and jobs.³²⁹ The real beneficiaries of the destructive race to the bottom in corporate taxes have been corporations and their wealthy shareholders and owners.³³⁰

FIGURE 5: HOW CUTS TO CORPORATE TAXES DRIVE FALLING TAX RATES ON THE WEALTHY

Average tax rate of the top 0.1% (% of pre-tax income) in the USA, 1950–2019

Source: E. Saez and G. Zucman. (2020).³³¹

3.2.4 Corporate tax dodging comes at the expense of everyone else

The collapse of taxes on corporations and their wealthy owners hasn't just lined the pockets of the ultra-wealthy – it has come at a great cost for societies. To compensate for the loss of tax revenue from corporations and their rich owners, many governments have turned to those with the least ability to pay.³³² They have increasingly relied on regressive taxes on goods and services, such as value-added tax (VAT), which falls disproportionately on low-income households and exacerbates gender inequality.³³³

The loss of corporate taxes also means there is less revenue to spend on inequality-busting public services.³³⁴ For example, in Morocco, tax incentives – 43.9% of which benefit corporations – added up to more than the

entire health budget allocated for 2021.³³⁵ Women are particularly impacted: first as the primary users of public services; second as workers, given their disproportionate employment in the public sector; and third as the main providers of unpaid care work, which must increase to fill the gaps in public provision.³³⁶ Greater tax revenue could help to stave off harmful cuts to public services that often disproportionately affect women, such as in Nigeria, where despite an extremely high maternal mortality rate, the government in 2020 proposed cutting the primary health budget by over 40% to deal with the economic fallout of COVID-19.³³⁷

The collapse of corporate tax also inflicts a great global injustice. Giant corporations in the Global North extract massive amounts of wealth from the Global South, while

often paying little to no tax.³³⁸ Drastic reductions in corporate tax have been a key feature in all regions but their effect has been especially harsh in Global South countries, which tend to be more reliant on corporate income tax revenue to fund public spending. For example, African countries are nearly twice as reliant as OECD countries on revenue from corporate income tax to fund their public spending.³³⁹ An estimated US\$200bn is also lost annually due to corporate tax avoidance, with Global South countries again tending to suffer the impacts disproportionately.³⁴⁰

3.3 Privatizing public services

An important – if underappreciated – way in which corporate power drives inequality is via the privatization of public services. Around the world, corporate power is relentlessly pushing into the public sector, commodifying and too often segregating access to vital services including education, water and healthcare. This is often while enjoying massive, taxpayer-backed profits and gutting the ability of governments to deliver the type of high-quality, universal public services that can transform lives and reduce inequality.³⁴¹

Privatization can work well for the wealthy – including economic and political elites, who may benefit financially, as well as those with enough resources to pay for expensive private services. However, a robust body of evidence demonstrates that in many instances privatization drives exclusion, impoverishment and other harmful consequences, particularly for people in poverty, women and girls, and racialized peoples.

3.3.1 Contemporary privatization

Privatization takes different forms. Although privatization is often associated with the sale of state-owned enterprises or structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) promoted by international financial institutions in the 1980s and 1990s, it remains prominent today. It still takes place through the outright sale of assets, but also often through the purposeful integration of the corporate sector into public policies and programmes, including through vouchers, outsourcing and public-private partnerships (PPPs).

Corporate power is pushing to displace public services and pump profits out of essential sectors that are core to the

realization of rights. Privatization arrangements, which vary by sector, now reach a staggering array of key goods and services, from foster to elder care, schooling to prisons, and roads to parking meters. The defunding of public services can be considered a type of *de facto* privatization, as service users must turn to the private sector to meet their critical needs. International institutions remain closely involved in promoting contemporary forms of privatization as well as other fiscal reforms that contribute to pressures to privatize.³⁴²

3.3.2 Increasing corporate influence over public resources

Privatization often entails giving corporations control over significant areas of policymaking,³⁴³ as well as access to public resources and capacity that could otherwise be dedicated to providing universal services and reducing inequality.³⁴⁴ Despite the promotion of privatization as a cost-saving measure, many contemporary arrangements such as PPPs and outsourcing can be highly costly to the state and require taxpayers to guarantee private sector profits.³⁴⁵ The fiscal risks of PPPs are particularly extreme, earning them the nickname ‘budgetary timebombs’.³⁴⁶ That such arrangements often place a high burden on public coffers and routinely cost more than public delivery undermines arguments that privatization is necessary because the public sector lacks sufficient resources.³⁴⁷

Private equity funds, hedge funds and other major institutional investors are turning to PPPs and other forms of privatized services to generate stable returns.³⁴⁸ Major development agencies and institutions, many of which have adopted policies that prioritize private provision of services,³⁴⁹ have found common ground with investors by embracing approaches that ‘de-risk’ such arrangements by shifting financial risk from the private to the public sector.³⁵⁰ This new ‘Wall Street Consensus’ reframes the ‘Washington Consensus’ in the language of contemporary development speak, and envisions the transformation of basic services such as education, healthcare and water into financial assets backed by public resources.³⁵¹

3.3.3 Enriching billionaires, private equity funds and crony capitalists

The stakes are huge. Essential services constitute trillion-dollar industries and represent immense opportunities for


generating profit and wealth for billionaires. Private equity firms are snapping up everything from water systems and healthcare providers to nursing homes, amid a litany of concerns about poor and even tragic outcomes.³⁵² For example, despite findings from countries such as the UK that privatized public transport can be expensive, unreliable and dysfunctional, with harmful consequences for the people who rely on it,³⁵³ entire public transport systems are being targeted by companies with track records of using precarious contract labour, also posing a threat to public sector jobs.³⁵⁴ Private-equity-backed Via promises a new transit service ‘in weeks, not months’, and estimates the market to be worth US\$450bn.³⁵⁵

These sectors are generating massive wealth for billionaire owners. The global hospital services market is expected to be valued at US\$19 trillion by 2030,³⁵⁶ and in

India alone, four billionaires are invested in the private hospital and diagnostic sector.³⁵⁷ An analysis of PPPs in the UK health sector found rates of return of up to 60%,³⁵⁸ while UK private children’s homes yielded a 22.6% operating margin.³⁵⁹ The global water and sewage market is estimated to reach US\$886bn in 2027.³⁶⁰

Privatization often occurs in sectors with few competitors and high barriers to entry, and sometimes even with the benefit of state-granted monopolies and taxpayer-guaranteed returns. A recent analysis of 51 companies receiving public contracts in the USA found that these companies spent nearly US\$160bn on stock buybacks between 2020 and 2023, meaning taxpayer money was in effect lining the pockets of rich shareholders.³⁶¹

With massive amounts of public money on the line, and policymakers in a position to enrich their friends, donors



Nairobi Women’s Hospital, Kenya. Photo by Linda Oduor-Noah/Oxfam.

and other allies, privatization creates opportunities for corruption and state capture. Corporate interests can seek to shape arrangements to benefit their bottom line instead of the public interest.³⁶² Privatization thus opens the door to cronyism – the ability of powerful private interests to manipulate public policy and enrich themselves at the public’s expense.³⁶³

3.3.4 Harming access for the many

Privatization can drive and reinforce inequalities in vital public services, segregating access to the most basic public goods. For example, in healthcare, privatization can entrench and exacerbate the gap between rich and poor, and exclude and impoverish those who cannot pay for expensive private care (see Box 8).³⁶⁴ In education, a large body of research shows that privatization drives educational inequalities, as even low-fee private schools are likely to be unaffordable for the poorest families.³⁶⁵ The privatization of social protection has also been tied to increases in inequality, for example, pension reforms in Latin America and Eastern Europe in the 1980s–2000s have been linked to increasing income and gender inequality as well as rising old-age poverty.³⁶⁶

Individuals and communities whose needs are less profitable to meet may be excluded or receive substandard care, as has been observed in the context of people with disabilities or those in rural areas.³⁶⁷ And too often, programmes designed to remediate this effect and ensure universal access to privatized services, such as vouchers or insurance schemes, fail to do so.³⁶⁸

Privatization can also drive inequalities on the basis of race and caste. It has been employed as a tactic to maintain racial segregation; this has been seen in the USA, where critics of integrated schools sought to use vouchers to preserve segregated educational settings.³⁶⁹ Privatization efforts in Global South and North countries alike have been compared to contemporary forms of white elite campaigns to segregate, control and profit from school systems.³⁷⁰ Racialized peoples often have lower incomes and higher rates of poverty because of historical

and continued systemic discrimination and exploitation, and thus are disproportionately affected by the harms of privatization.³⁷¹ Oxfam research found that Dalits in India face high and unaffordable out-of-pocket fees in the private healthcare sector,³⁷² financial exclusion in the private education sector, and overt discrimination in both.³⁷³ Other research shows that privatization can curtail the ability of the public sector to reduce labour market inequalities by race.³⁷⁴

Whereas gender-responsive, universal and high-quality public services can close gender gaps and enable women and girls to realize their rights, privatization can exacerbate gender inequalities.³⁷⁵ Women typically earn less than men and are often employed at higher rates by the public sector.^{376, 377} They are, therefore, disproportionately hurt by the withdrawal and defunding of public provision and by steps to generate profit, such as the introduction of higher prices and user fees.³⁷⁸ Women often have more responsibility for a range of critical tasks including water collection and care work; in situations where privatization has rendered such services less affordable or less physically accessible, women’s unpaid labour has often had to fill the gap.³⁷⁹

Indeed, in a broad range of sectors, privatization has been found to harm women and girls. The private sector has been linked with neglect of women’s routine healthcare needs;³⁸⁰ with reductions in girls’ access to schooling, as families with limited resources prioritize boys’ education (e.g. despite gender parity in Tunisia’s *public* primary schools, the share of girls in *private* schools drops to 30%),³⁸¹ and with increases in labour force inequality.³⁸² PPPs specifically have been linked to negative impacts on women’s healthcare services, livelihoods, working conditions and unpaid care work.³⁸³

Privatization can also open the door to intentional discrimination based on gender identity and sexual orientation. For example, in 2023, the UN Independent Expert on sexual orientation and gender identity raised concerns about discrimination by private groups charged with providing foster care, adoption services and education.³⁸⁴

Box 8: How private hospitals backed by development finance institutions cause harm

In 2023, Oxfam research revealed that patients living in poverty in the Global South were being bankrupted by for-profit healthcare corporations backed by multimillion-dollar investments from development finance institutions (DFIs) run by the UK, French, German and other rich-country governments, as well as the World Bank Group.³⁸⁵ Despite being promoted as a way to achieve universal health coverage, Oxfam found that private healthcare providers in India, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and elsewhere were pushing patients into poverty. The investigation found cases of extorting and imprisoning patients for non-payment of bills; denying treatment to those who can't afford it – even in emergencies; failing to prevent human rights abuses, including organ trafficking by staff; and exploitative practices, such as by pressuring patients to have unnecessary and expensive medical procedures.³⁸⁶

In India, where the private healthcare sector is now worth US\$236bn and rising rapidly, the World Bank's private sector arm, the International Finance Corporation (IFC), has directly invested over half a billion dollars in some of the country's largest corporate hospital chains owned by some of its richest billionaires. Yet in June 2023, Oxfam found that the IFC has not published a single evaluation of its health projects in India since these started over 25 years ago. Indian health regulators have upheld multiple complaints, including cases of hospitals overcharging, rigging prices and refusing to treat patients living in poverty for free, despite this being a condition of receiving government land for free. Furthermore, of the 144 hospitals funded, only one is located in a rural area.³⁸⁷

3.4. Driving climate breakdown

Corporate power is driving climate breakdown, in turn causing great suffering and exacerbating extreme inequalities. Corporations' pursuit of short-term profits has brought the world to the brink of climate breakdown, as fossil fuels continue to build fortunes for many of the super-rich. Yet still today, many billionaire owners and investors benefit when corporate power and influence seek to block progress on a fast and just transition, deny and spin the truth about climate change, and crush opposition.

3.4.1 Contributing to climate change

The role of corporate power, and in particular the fossil fuel industry (see Box 9), in driving and profiting from activities that cause the climate crisis is well documented.³⁸⁸ Despite lofty pledges to transform, the industry continues to promote new fossil fuel investments,³⁸⁹ while investments in low-carbon businesses represent less than 1% of oil and gas companies' capital expenditure.³⁹⁰

Some of the false 'solutions' championed by the world's biggest polluters and their financiers are failing to prevent climate breakdown, and instead exacerbating poverty and inequality.³⁹¹ Despite the clear standards for strong corporate climate action set by the Science Based Target initiative (SBTi), the UN High-Level Expert Group on the Net-Zero Emissions Commitments of Non-State Entities, and others, far too many corporate 'net-zero' climate plans are simply greenwashing, and are not leading to the rapid and meaningful emissions reductions that are needed.³⁹²

3.4.2 Influencing climate policy and public opinion

Fossil fuel companies have known for decades that greenhouse gases could cause potentially catastrophic climate change, yet they have continually sought to defend and prolong the deadly status quo by influencing public policy and opinion.³⁹³ Corporations spend massive amounts on campaigning and lobbying, and increasingly dominate UN climate negotiations.³⁹⁴ Fossil fuel corporations are fighting political and PR battles, for example: backing efforts to oppose the phase-out of residential gas connections in Australia,³⁹⁵

weaken penalties for emitters in South Africa;³⁹⁶ rollback fuel efficiency standards;³⁹⁷ and foster opposition to environmental, social and governance (ESG) investment practices in the USA.³⁹⁸ These efforts are complemented by a revolving door between governments and fossil fuel companies,³⁹⁹ as well as the promotion of climate denialism and other fossil fuel-friendly messaging.⁴⁰⁰

3.4.3 Enriching carbon billionaires

The climate crisis has made some people incredibly rich, generating wealth that is often reinvested in fossil fuels

and used to fund the carbon-intensive lifestyles of the ultra-rich. Many of the world's billionaires own, control, shape and financially profit from processes that emit greenhouse gases.⁴⁰¹ Fossil fuel companies brought in record income in 2022, much of which was used to enrich shareholders through big buybacks and dividends.⁴⁰² In 2022, Oxfam undertook a detailed analysis of 125 of the world's richest billionaires and found that, on average, through their investments they emit three million tonnes of CO₂ a year – over a million times more than the average emissions of someone in the bottom 90% of humanity.⁴⁰³



Polluting smoke rising from a coal-fired power plant. Photo by Lane V. Erickson/Shutterstock.

Box 9: The fossil fuel industry takes its fight to court

The fossil fuel industry has launched what amounts to an all-out legal war against those fighting to protect people and the planet, bringing cases against regulatory action, massive arbitration claims and abusive lawsuits to punish criticism.⁴⁰⁴ These include unwarranted suits against Indigenous and community leaders, activists, academics and other members of civil society.⁴⁰⁵ The growing use of these 'strategic lawsuits against public participation' has been condemned by the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights.⁴⁰⁶

Using what economist Joseph Stiglitz has referred to as 'litigation terrorism',⁴⁰⁷ the fossil fuel industry has also brought massive arbitration claims against countries that have taken measures to curb emissions and protect the environment.⁴⁰⁸ Companies are increasingly using investor-state dispute systems to challenge government action to limit or phase out fossil fuels,⁴⁰⁹ their claims average US\$1.4bn, and are estimated to have resulted in at least US\$100bn in payouts.⁴¹⁰ The vast majority of fossil fuel and mining claims are brought by companies from the Global North against countries in the Global South,⁴¹¹ stripping them of resources at a time when many are already debt-distressed.⁴¹²

3.4.4 Inequality of impact

Climate-related displacement has already pushed tens of millions of people from their homes,⁴¹³ and extreme weather is decimating agriculture and contributing to mass hunger, armed conflict and humanitarian crises.⁴¹⁴ While rich people and rich countries are in many ways driving the climate crisis, it is people in LICs and those

living in poverty who are hit hardest, and almost anyone who faces discrimination because of their gender, race, religion, caste, class or age bears the brunt.⁴¹⁵ Many of the countries that are least responsible for global warming – mostly in the Global South – suffer the worst consequences of today's climate crisis and have fewer resources to help them recover.⁴¹⁶


Vulnerabilities to the impacts of climate change increase when economic inequality intersects with inequalities of power, such as gender, ethnicity and age.⁴¹⁷ Women, particularly those with lower socioeconomic status, tend to have less access to relief and assistance, lower survival rates following climate-related disasters, and increased care responsibilities.⁴¹⁸ Women also face greater risks from the effects of heat stress as well as risks related to maternal and child health.⁴¹⁹

Within countries, the effects of climate change are inflicted disproportionately on racialized peoples. For example, in the USA, racialized peoples tend to live in hotter neighbourhoods with less tree cover than white residents and are less likely to have air conditioning.⁴²⁰ Indigenous peoples, whose sustainable approaches to land management have long faced threats from extractive industries, are severely affected by climate change. This is due to their close relationship with the environment, and the systemic discrimination and marginalization they face that results in widespread denial of their rights.⁴²¹

As discussed in Chapter 4, corporate-fuelled inequality can be reversed, including through a new era of anti-monopoly action, regulations to ensure decent work and a fair share for all, and radically different ways of doing business. The collapse in corporate taxes must be addressed through a new tax paradigm characterized by strongly progressive taxes, an end to corporate tax dodging, and inclusive efforts to build a fairer global tax system. Publicly owned and controlled services are often better positioned to provide universal, affordable, gender-responsive, and high-quality essential services to all.

Chapter 4

TOWARDS AN ECONOMY FOR ALL



4. TOWARDS AN ECONOMY FOR ALL

In this chapter, we look at key steps that can be taken: first, to radically increase the level of equality in the world, at national and global levels; and second, to rein in corporate power and build economies for all, not economies that seek to reward only the richest.

4.1 A radical increase in equality must be humanity's most urgent priority

Rapidly and radically reducing the gap between the richest and the rest of society is vital to ensuring a good life for all, on a planet that is flourishing, not struggling to survive.

Governments throughout the world need to develop concrete plans for inequality reduction and better capture the impact of their policies on reducing inequality. The

Brazil-led G20 and the UN Summit of the Future reform process have a critical role to play in bringing countries from the Global North and South together to make the world a more equal place by reducing inequality between and within countries.

Improving the quality of data and methods of measuring inequality is an essential first step. The UN must commit to strengthening the indicators for the reduction of within-country inequality under Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 10. Under Brazil's leadership, the G20 should commit to radically reducing inequality between the Global North and the Global South.

All governments have the scope to reduce inequality within their countries – and must set national goals and develop plans to do so. This should include clear, time-



Adjacent favela and upscale neighbourhoods in São Paulo, Brazil. Photo by Danny Lehman.

bound targets to reduce economic inequality, aiming for the total income of the top 10% of the population to be no more than the total income of the bottom 40%, known as a Palma ratio of 1.

Governments must also invest in high-quality data collection on inequality in both income and wealth. The richest people should not be able to avoid being counted. This should include data disaggregated by gender, race and other dimensions of discrimination. Systematically projecting and measuring the distributional impacts of public policy and private-sector activity could enable evidence-driven policy to reduce inequality. Countries should undertake annual assessments of policy choices and their impact on improving the income, wealth and freedoms of all citizens, and on minimizing inequality.

4.2 Reining in corporate power: three practical steps

Runaway corporate power and runaway extreme wealth have been contained and controlled in the past and they can be again. This report outlines three concrete, proven and practical ways to make the economy work for all of us.

1. Revitalize the state

A strong, dynamic and effective state is the best bulwark against corporate power and a remedy to correct market failures. It is also key to steering and shaping the economy towards collective goals. A strong state is the provider of public goods, the regulator of private enterprises, the lead investor for several sectors, and a maker and shaper of markets. Governments de-risk businesses and fund them through public procurement.⁴²² They set the terms under which various players in the economy work together to build public value and knowledge, socialize rewards, and ensure accountability and transparency in the system.⁴²³

In most countries, the state is the primary agent of social services (such as healthcare, education and social security), utilities and infrastructure (such as water, energy, roads, telecommunications and post), state security (police, firefighting, justice and defence), and culture services (such as libraries, museums and public broadcasting). At the same time, governments own and operate national commercial ventures in sectors including

finance, infrastructure, manufacturing, energy and natural resources. These state-owned entities accounted for 20% of investment, 5% of employment and up to 40% of domestic output worldwide in 2018.⁴²⁴ State-owned enterprises undertake 55% of total infrastructure investment in 'emerging and developing economies'.⁴²⁵ The power of the state to act for the collective good came to the forefront during the COVID-19 crisis.⁴²⁶

While determining which parts of the economy are to be publicly delivered is a choice to be made by individual countries and societies, governments must recognize their power and take a proactive role. They must:

- Guarantee inequality-busting public services such as healthcare, education and care services; deliver universal, rights-based social protection, including for those working in the informal economy; and increase public spending on these. Public goods such as education and health should be governed in the public interest, through a gender-responsive approach, and be predominantly owned and delivered by the public sector. Health and education should be free of charge paid for by progressive taxation.
- Invest in public transport, energy, housing and other public infrastructure. Support people's right to access energy for personal and livelihood purposes, and to prepare for and protect themselves against climate impacts such as flooding, storms and extreme heat.
- Explore a public monopoly or public option in sectors that are prone to monopoly power and key to both increasing equality and driving a rapid transition away from fossil fuels. These could include public energy, public transport (where the infrastructure investment costs mean there can only be one efficient provider) and other sectors where there is a significant national benefit. It is important to recognize those public options that already exist, from public libraries to housing, and from court defenders to highways, universities, museums and postal services, and to expand them. From efforts on public banking to a public option for pharmaceuticals – in which governments provide quality-assured medicines that are universally available to all, alongside private options – there is huge scope for government action to assert public power and shape markets for the better.⁴²⁷

- Strengthen governance, including improving transparency, accountability and public participation and oversight of public institutions (including state-owned enterprises); ensure that these institutions are adequately funded to achieve their economic and social mandates.
- End the for-profit provision of public goods sectors such as education and health. Any delivery of public goods by private actors should be governed in the public interest and, to the extent possible, owned by the public. Private provision should not contribute to segregation in society based on family wealth, race, gender, or any other identity. It should not increase inequality, must have democratic oversight and adhere to national standards of quality. This entails strengthening, financing and staffing regulatory capacity to enforce regulations to ensure that the private sector serves the common good.

2. Regulate corporations

Powerful corporations are driving extreme inequality, all too often overpowering governments and undermining the choices and freedoms of people globally. Governments must use their power to rein in the runaway power of corporations.

Break up private monopolies and prevent corporate power from becoming too large

Oxfam calls for anti-monopoly action, geared towards addressing historic levels of inequality. This involves a fundamental shift in approach, such that concentrated private power can no longer rival public power. Economic structures must be proactively reformed to prevent harmful monopolistic behaviour from taking place. It is vital that anti-monopoly efforts are not limited to action *within* the market; rather, the *role of the state* needs to be reimagined, as governments have done historically, decentralizing and nationalizing private power in the public interest.

Efforts must be guided by an anti-monopoly movement that is growing worldwide. Every country has its context, but universal principles can apply. Governments must:

- **Break up private monopolies and curb extreme corporate concentration.** Taking a country-specific approach, the

full potential of the law should be considered to break up existing private monopolies, block monopolistic mergers and reform merger rules to prevent monopoly power from accruing in the first place. No corporation should be able to capture enough market share to give it undue power. Governments can learn from current anti-monopoly cases, such as those against Amazon and Google in the USA and Europe.⁴²⁸

Many countries have created legal measures and mechanisms to curb corporate monopoly powers in recent decades.⁴²⁹ These include: action to pass tougher standards for mergers that reshape industries; enforcing anti-monopoly laws already on the books (noting that enforcement is weak across geographies); and new laws that overturn harmful laws and create those which are fit for the 21st century; all towards better governing markets in the public interest.⁴³⁰ Anti-monopoly enforcement works: past break ups have led to explosions of innovation,⁴³¹ and enforcement generally has been shown to reverse many of the harms of monopoly by raising wages, increasing employment and lowering prices.⁴³³

- **Break up the monopoly over knowledge and democratize trade and patent rules.** At national and international levels, it is necessary to overhaul trade rules allowing corporations to aggressively control intellectual property that is vital to tackling inequality,⁴³⁴ combatting deadly diseases⁴³⁵ and the climate crisis,⁴³⁶ and enabling Global South countries to assert their sovereignty. This includes ending the abusive use of patents when their enforcement is against the public interest; reviving anti-trust restrictions on patents and patent licensing; making permanent reforms to waive patents in international trade rules in critical areas such as the pharmaceutical sector; and sharing knowledge through initiatives such as the World Health Organization's mRNA vaccine technology transfer hub.
- **Back dynamic public solutions and assert greater public control.** Greater private competition is not a panacea, but a part of the solution for public regulation. Restoring greater public control is a central part of the anti-monopoly toolbox. It includes delivering universal public services and utilities, as well as public options and public

involvement in the economy: actions that can curtail corporate concentration and private monopoly power. Determining which parts of the economy are to be publicly delivered is a choice to be made by individual countries and societies. However, all governments must recognize the power of public services and public provision, and take a proactive role in shaping the economy to reduce corporate power to fight inequality. As such, governments should explore a public monopoly or public option in all sectors that are subject to undue market concentration and monopoly power.⁴³⁷

Ensure no share dividend payments or share buybacks before living wages and climate justice

Restricting payouts could act as a powerful incentive for companies to fulfil their social and environmental duties. Governments should do this by preventing companies from paying out until:

- They are paying a living wage to all employees and a strategy is in place, with time-bound and measurable objectives, to ensure that workers in supply chains receive a living wage/income.
- The company has made the investments necessary to ensure a low-carbon transition and is on a clear, time-bound trajectory to achieve carbon emissions objectives aligned with the Paris Agreement.

Introduce legally binding measures on mandatory gendered human rights and environmental due diligence (mHRDD)

Companies should be required to conduct due diligence to identify and manage human rights and environmental risks and impacts in their operations and supply chains. The law would hold them liable for failing to prevent abuse and responsible for remedy, as set out in the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.⁴³⁸ Women are disproportionately impacted, and the law should take a gender-justice perspective as laid out by the Feminists for a Binding Treaty.⁴³⁹ The legislative bodies of the EU are negotiating a Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive that would require EU companies and non-EU companies active on the European market to take steps to address risks for human rights and the environment.⁴⁴⁰ However, the original proposals have been watered down and the Directive is now riddled with loopholes.⁴⁴¹

Strengthen laws for gender and racial justice

Governments should introduce and ensure the full enforcement of laws relating to gender-based equity in pay and the elimination of all forms of gender-based discrimination, violence and harassment. They must:

- Require corporations to publish and implement gender and inclusion policies that would cover hiring, training, promotion, harassment and grievance reporting, and introduce care-responsibility-supporting working conditions.⁴⁴² Companies should aim to achieve diversity in terms of race, educational background and expertise through a published diversity strategy with targets that are regularly reported against. They should be required to report gender and racial pay gaps. Following the introduction of mandatory gender pay gap reporting in the UK, the wage gap between women and men has closed by 19% on average,⁴⁴³ although this progress risks stalling if companies don't take a comprehensive approach to closing the gap.
- Follow up on racial justice recommendations provided by the UN.⁴⁴⁴ This would involve: developing and enforcing legislation on non-discrimination; developing action plans to end racism and discrimination; promoting access to employment; and addressing barriers to employment.
- Recognize, reduce and redistribute unpaid care work by collecting better data on the provision of care; investing in physical and social infrastructure that supports care; supporting child and elderly care, paid family and medical leave, flexible working hours and paid parental leave; and challenging the social norms that delegate unpaid care work mainly to women and girls, especially those who are migrants, racialized or marginalized, leading to an unequal gendered distribution of care work.⁴⁴⁵ Equal paid parental leave, paid at 100% of prior salary, should be available to all genders for at least 18 weeks, in line with ILO recommendations.⁴⁴⁶

Support and encourage trade unions

Living wages and decent work for the world's workers are fundamental to ending today's inequality crisis. Legal standards should protect the rights of workers to unionize and strike; laws that restrict these rights should be rescinded. Collective bargaining agreements should be allowed and supported.

Cap CEO pay

While millions of ordinary workers remain on poverty wages, CEOs claim enormous incomes. It has previously been estimated that with just slightly more than one day of work, a CEO in the USA earns the same as an ordinary worker makes during the whole year.⁴⁴⁷ Female CEO pay is on average lower relative to male CEOs.⁴⁴⁸ Overall, men tend to earn more than women⁴⁴⁹ and racial pay gaps persist.⁴⁵⁰ It is important to limit top pay to no more than 20 times that of the average (median) worker and close gender and racial pay gaps.

Radically increase taxes on rich individuals and corporations

As this report shows, corporations and the wealthiest individuals are the primary beneficiaries of the value created by the global workforce of billions (many of whom are surviving on poverty wages), the extraction of natural resources and the unpaid care work of women. Governments should increase taxes on the income and wealth of super-rich individuals and on corporations, with the G20 championing a new international agreement on this crucial inequality-busting agenda. Governments should:

- **Introduce comprehensive and permanent taxation of the wealthiest in every country.** Reducing the wealth of the richest and the number of super-rich people could also reduce their dominant influence on politics and policy. Oxfam has calculated that a wealth tax on the world's millionaires and billionaires could generate US\$2.5 trillion dollars each year.⁴⁵¹ A net wealth tax should be levied in a progressive way on the net value of all assets.
- **Urgently increase taxes on dividends and capital gains.** Taxes need to rise on income from stocks, shares, rent and other revenue that the rich disproportionately rely on – at rates that are at least as high as those on income from work, and preferably higher: for example, to a minimum of 60% of their income from labour and capital.
- **Tax windfall profits and move towards permanent taxes on excess profits.** The previous chapters have highlighted evidence of crisis profiteering by some corporations, especially within the pharmaceutical, energy and food sectors, over the last three years. A windfall tax should be applied to big companies across all sectors registering

sudden, excessive increases in profits during crisis. Of course, excess profits also occur outside crisis periods, particularly when companies hold monopolistic positions, that's why governments and global institutions should explore permanent taxes on excess profits to curb the power of corporations and turn corporate income tax into a more progressive design.⁴⁵²

- **Move towards a more effective taxation of large corporations, especially on their cross-border corporations.** No other progressive tax has declined as fast globally as the corporate income tax, which is also undermined by tax competition and profit shifting. A more effective minimum level of taxation must be implemented in every country, at least as high as 25% (as recommended by the Independent Commission for the Reform of International Corporate taxation; ICRICT), to avoid the floor becoming the ceiling.
- **Curb tax avoidance by:**
 - › Making multinational corporations disclose their profits, revenue, number of employees and other key financial numbers in all countries where they operate, through public country-by-country tax reporting.
 - › Requiring companies to reveal their true owners by developing public registers of the beneficial owners of companies, foundations and trusts, and moving towards the creation of a Global Asset Registry.⁴⁵³
 - › Introducing global or regional systems to tax multinational corporations where they have real economic activities, based – for example – on their number of employees, sales and fixed capital, and ban the use of shell companies that are used to hide profit without real economic activity.
 - › Ultimately, a fairer, more inclusive and transparent global architecture on taxation is necessary, by supporting an ambitious framework convention on tax under the UN initiated in a historic vote in November 2023.⁴⁵⁴

3. Reinvent business

The damaging impacts of the increased concentration of wealth, the automation of industry, and climate catastrophe demand that we create a radically different way of doing business. Corporate structures are by design undemocratic, run by and in the interest of a small elite.

Injecting democratic ownership and governance into mainstream business could not only help tackle wealth inequalities; it would also drive business decisions that better reflect the issues that matter to society. This is not unthinkable: in 2018, 19% of US workers owned some share in their employer. Employee owners from racialized groups and women employee owners have a 30% and 17% higher wage income, respectively, compared to non-employee

FIGURE 6: CHARACTERISTICS OF HYBRID AND EQUITABLE BUSINESS MODELS



Source: A. Maitland and S. Ciencia. (2018). *The Future of Business: Shaping Inclusive Growth in South-East Asia*.⁴⁵⁵

owners, and employee owners have greater job security and lower turnover across income levels than their non-employee owner counterparts.⁴⁵⁶ Competitive and profitable businesses don't have to be shackled by shareholder greed. The future of business lies in business structures that have dual goals of financial sustainability and social purpose. There is a diverse range of alternatives to the shareholder-first business model – worker and local cooperatives, social enterprises and fair-trade businesses – that are owned and governed in the interest of workers,

local communities and the environment. What makes these businesses different is that their governance is democratic, ownership isn't concentrated so profit is more fairly shared, and they are driven by a social mission. These characteristics are summarized in Figure 6.⁴⁵⁷

This model needn't be limited to direct employees of companies. There are some companies that are partially owned by cooperatives in their supply chains. For example, Cafédirect is 5% owned by the farming cooperatives that supply it.⁴⁵⁸ Farmer groups are represented on the board and get a share of any dividends paid.⁴⁵⁹

Companies don't have to start as equitable businesses. Some are gradually transitioning by, for example, voluntarily introducing employee representation on their boards, while others are going a step further and transforming their entire ownership structure. The former-billionaire owner of clothing company Patagonia put the company's ownership into a trust that will benefit environmental efforts and declared that 'Earth is our only shareholder.'⁴⁶⁰ Many companies are converting from privately owned to employee- or community-owned businesses.

Governments can support alternative business by:

- Providing financial support to employee-owned businesses, including worker cooperatives. This includes the implementation of ILO Recommendation no.193 on promoting cooperatives and relevant regional instruments.⁴⁶¹
- Using public procurement and export incentives to give preferential treatment to sustainable and inclusive companies. Public tender processes should give overwhelmingly negative scores for large companies that are performing poorly on sustainability criteria, so that procurement isn't driven by the lowest price, and enable more competition from more equitably structured businesses.
- Using tax and other economic instruments to prioritize equitable business models. No economic aid should be given to companies that are missing their net zero targets, paying below living wages, using tax havens, or engaging in aggressive tax planning.

Box 10: How alternative business approaches can reduce inequality

- The World Fair Trade Organization is a growing global network of social enterprises and cooperatives that put people and planet first:⁴⁶²
 - 52% of CEOs of its member organizations are women.⁴⁶³ (In the UK, you're more likely to be called Dave or Steve than to be a female CEO.⁴⁶⁴)
 - 92% of its members reinvest all profits in their social mission and 85% sacrifice profits for social or environmental goals, but are still four times less likely than traditional businesses to go bankrupt.⁴⁶⁵
- Indicatively, if just 10% of every business in the USA was employee-owned, it could double the share of wealth of the bottom 50% and the median wealth of Black households.⁴⁶⁶
- Areas with high cooperative density have lower levels of inequality. For example, Gipuzkoa, the Spanish province where Mondragon cooperative group headquarters is based, has a lower Gini index than Norway and Finland.⁴⁶⁷

4.3 Room for hope

Political leaders must call time on the economic model that puts rich shareholders above all else, and instead listen to their citizens who are demanding a fairer, more prosperous economy for all. Trying to wrench back control of the global economy from elites might seem like an impossible task but there is hope – as these examples from around the world demonstrate:

In Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), a groundbreaking summit between governments led to the constitution of a permanent LAC Tax Platform to cooperate on tax. This is setting a new direction for more progressive taxation and for the region to raise a united voice on the international tax reform process.⁴⁶⁸

In November 2022, a new resolution presented by the African Group was agreed upon, which gives the UN a mandate to develop intergovernmental talks on tax.⁴⁶⁹ This could take control of global tax policy, away from corporate and rich-country interests, and could be a breakthrough for progressive taxation.

Civil society campaigners around the world are winning hard-fought campaigns, such as breaking monopolies on drugs to treat TB.⁴⁷⁰ Amsterdam's Schiphol Airport, which has come under sustained pressure to reduce carbon emissions, announced a ban on private jets just months after Greenpeace and Extinction Rebellion activists blocked private jets on the runway.^{471, 472} Even some rich individuals have been campaigning to be taxed more.⁴⁷³

Ten percent of the world now works for a cooperative,⁴⁷⁴ and this share is growing. From rural social enterprises that are delivering decent work for women and marginalized groups, to huge multinational cooperatives that are lifting entire regions out of poverty, many parts of the private sector can bring us hope.

In the USA, the Federal Trade Commission recently filed a lawsuit against Amazon for anti-competitive behaviour.⁴⁷⁵ Meanwhile, the EU also ordered a mandatory divestment of part of Google's advertising business over competition concerns.⁴⁷⁶

Ultimately, hope is a choice. The continued path is one where the dominant model is of business and politics at the service of extreme capital, enabled by monopolists and financiers. However, a clear alternative is also on offer: one in which 21st-century transformative public power repurposes our economy; in which regulated and reimagined business creates value for communities and workers as well as owners and executives; in which innovation and ingenuity are not treated as the preserve of the few but unleashed to serve the interests of the many.

This choice is one, above all, for governments to make – and for citizens across the world to come together to advocate to make this reality. This report is dedicated to those fighting for a more equal world.

ENDNOTES

- 1 See methodology note, stat 1.0.
- 2 K. Duggan. (20 July 2021). *Everything to know about Tuesday's Blue Origin space launch with Jeff Bezos*. Fortune. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://fortune.com/2021/07/19/jeff-bezos-space-launch-blue-origin-july-20-2021-billionaires>
- 3 D. Streitfield. (16 March 2021). *How Amazon Crushes Unions*. New York Times. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/16/technology/amazon-unions-virginia.html>
- 4 Oxfam interview with Reverend Ryan Brown, 4 October 2023.
- 5 Oxfam America. (June 2018). *US Supermarket Supply Chains: Ending the human suffering behind our food*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21201/2018.1633>
- 6 Oxfam. (n.d.). *Behind the seafood in our markets: stories of human suffering*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/behind-seafood-our-markets-stories-human-suffering>
- 7 See methodology note, stat 1.0.
- 8 See methodology note, stat 1.0.
- 9 See methodology note, stat 1.6.
- 10 A principal shareholder is defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the USA. A principal shareholder's voting shares allow the shareholder to vote on who should be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or who would sit on the company's board of directors. Investopedia. (2022). *Principal Shareholder: Meaning, Requirements, Primary Shareholder*. Accessed 29 November 2023. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/principal-shareholder.asp>
- 11 See methodology note, stat 3.0.
- 12 See methodology note, stat 1.4. Whilst using the term 'men' and 'women' throughout this report to describe the gender divide amongst billionaires, based largely on categorisations used in the Forbes billionaires list and other secondary data sources, we recognise that these are binary terms and may fail to capture and represent non-binary and other gender non-conforming people, for whom disaggregated data on wealth are unavailable, which prevents us from fully understanding gender-based wealth inequalities.
- 13 See methodology note, stat 1.8.
- 14 A. Khalfan et al. (2023). *Climate Equality: A Planet for the 99%*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/climate-equality-a-planet-for-the-99-621551/>
- 15 A. Aladangady, A.C. Chang and J. Krimmel. (2023). *Greater wealth, greater uncertainty: Changes in racial inequality in the survey of consumer finances*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/notes/feds-notes/greater-wealth-greater-uncertainty-changes-in-racial-inequality-in-the-survey-of-consumer-finances-20231018.html>
- 16 Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. (2019). *Desigualdades Sociais por Cor ou Raça no Brasil* (Portuguese). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/populacao/25844-desigualdades-sociais-por-cor-ou-raca.html>
- 17 See methodology note, stat 2.3.
- 18 See methodology note, stat 1.7.
- 19 See methodology note, stat 1.0.
- 20 World Bank. (2023). *10: Reduced Inequalities: Progress and setbacks in reducing income inequalities*. Atlas of Sustainable Development Goals 2023. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://datatopics.worldbank.org/sdgoals/goal-10-reduced-inequalities?lang=en>
- 21 See methodology note, stat 1.1.
- 22 A. Khalfan, et al. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 23 S. Wilkin. (31 March 2022). *2022 Political Risk Survey Report*. Accessed 29 November 2023. <https://www.wtco.com/en-gb/insights/2022/03/2022-political-risk-survey-report>
- 24 Oxfam. (9 October 2023). *World's poorest countries to slash public spending by more than \$220 billion in face of crushing debt*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/worlds-poorest-countries-slash-public-spending-more-220-billion-face-crushing-debt>
- 25 D. Abed and F. Kelleher. (2022). *The Assault of Austerity: How prevailing economic choices are a form of gender-based violence*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/the-assault-of-austerity-how-prevailing-economic-policy-choices-are-a-form-of-g-621448/>
- 26 See methodology note, stat 1.2.
- 27 See methodology note, stat 1.3.
- 28 Oxfam. (6 July 2023). *Big business' windfall profits rocket to "obscene" \$1 trillion a year amid cost-of-living crisis; Oxfam and ActionAid renew call for windfall taxes*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/big-business-windfall-profits-rocket-obscene-1-trillion-year-amid-cost-living-crisis>
- 29 See methodology note, stat 2.2.
- 30 See methodology note, stat 1.8.
- 31 See methodology note, stat 3.1.
- 32 A principal shareholder is defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the USA. A principal shareholder's voting shares allow the shareholder to vote on who should be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or who would sit on the company's board of directors. Investopedia. (2022). *Principal Shareholder: Meaning, Requirements, Primary Shareholder*. Accessed 29 November 2023. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/principal-shareholder.asp>
- 33 See methodology note, stat 3.0.
- 34 T. Pang et al. (2020). *Study on the Impact of Mergers and Acquisitions on Innovation in the Pharmaceutical Sector*. European Commission Publications Office. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/323819>

- 35 ETC Group. (2022). *Food Barons 2022*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.etcgroup.org/files/files/food-barons-2022-full_sectors-final_16_sept.pdf; S. Wixforth and K. Haddouti. (19 December 2022). *How big companies are profiting from inflation*. International Politics and Society blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ips-journal.eu/topics/economy-and-ecology/how-big-companies-are-profiting-from-inflation-6388/>
- 36 S. Joseph. (4 February 2022). *The Rundown: Google, Meta and Amazon are on track to absorb more than 50% of all ad money in 2022*. Digiday. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://digiday.com/marketing/the-rundown-google-meta-and-amazon-are-on-track-to-absorb-more-than-50-of-all-ad-money-in-2022/>
- 37 SimilarWeb. (2023). Search Engines Market Share (June 2023). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.similarweb.com/engines/>; D. McCabe and N. Grant. (11 September 2013). *Google Goes on Trial Over Justice Dept. Claims That It Has Monopoly Power*. *The New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/11/technology/google-monopoly-justice-dept-trial.html>
- 38 S. Robert. (2023). 'Competition, Trade, and Sustainability in Agriculture and Food Markets in Africa.' *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 39(1), Spring 2023, 147–61. <https://academic.oup.com/oxrep/article-abstract/39/1/147/7030599?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- 39 V. Acharya. (2023). *India at 75: Replete with Contradictions, Brimming with Opportunities, Saddled with Challenges*. Paper presented at a conference on the Brookings Paper on Economic Activity, 30–31 March 2023.
- 40 W. Chen et al. (2019). *World Economic Outlook, April 2019 Growth Slowdown, Precarious Recovery*. Chapter 2: The Rise of Corporate Market Power and Its Macroeconomic Effects. International Monetary Fund. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WE0/Issues/2019/03/28/world-economic-outlook-april-2019>
- 41 J. De Loecker, J. Eeckhout and G. Unger. (2020). 'The Rise of Market Power and the Macroeconomic Implications*', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(2), 561–644; J. Eeckhout. (2021) *The Profit Paradox: How Thriving Firms Threaten the Future of Work*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691222769>
- 42 I.M. Weber and E. Wasner. (2023). 'Sellers' Inflation, Profits and Conflict: Why can Large Firms Hike Prices in an Emergency?' Economics Department Working Paper Series. 343. <https://doi.org/10.7275/cbv0-gv07>
- 43 J. Ghosh. (8 June 2023). 'The Social Consequences of Inflation in Developing Countries.' *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 34(2), 203–11.
- 44 Balanced Economy Project. (16 December 2022). *How finance drives monopoly*. The Counterbalance. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://thecounterbalance.substack.com/p/how-finance-drives-monopoly-power?utm_source=profile&utm_medium=reader2 <https://thecounterbalance.substack.com/p/how-finance-drives-monopoly>; Bain & Company. (2019). *Global Private Equity Report 2019*. Bain & Company, Inc. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.bain.com/contentassets/875a49e26e9c4775942ec5b86084df0a/bain_report_private_equity_report_2019.pdf; Center for Economic and Policy Research. (2022). *Comment Letter in Response to the FTC and DOJ's Request for Information on Merger Enforcement*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://cepr.net/comment-letter-in-response-to-the-ftc-and-doj-s-request-for-information-on-merger-enforcement/>
- 45 D. Hearn et al. (2022). *The roll-up economy: the business of consolidating industries with serial acquisitions*. American Economic Liberties Project: Working paper series on corporate power. Accessed 1 December 2023. <http://www.economicliberties.us/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Serial-Acquisitions-Working-Paper-R4-2.pdf>
- 46 Total assets under investment worldwide according to the Boston Consulting Group are \$98 trillion in 2022, so the close to \$20 trillion BlackRock, State Street and Vanguard have under management represents nearly one-fifth. Boston Consulting Group. (15 May 2023). *Global Asset Management Industry Must Transform to Thrive Amidst Changing Macroeconomics*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bcg.com/press/15may2023-global-asset-management-transform-to-thrive>
- 47 E. Ethauge. (2020). 'How Horizontal Shareholding Harms Our Economy - And Why Antitrust Law Can Fix It' *Harvard Business Law Review*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3293822; D. McLaughlin and A. Massa. (9 January 2020). *The hidden dangers of the great index fund takeover*. Bloomberg. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2020-01-09/the-hidden-dangers-of-the-great-index-fund-takeover>
- 48 R. Vazquez-Alvarez et al. (2022). *Global Wage Report 2022–23: The Impact of Inflation and COVID-19 on Wages and Purchasing Power*. International Labour Organization. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://researchrepository.ilo.org/esploro/outputs/report/995264896002676>
- 49 See methodology note, stat 1.1.
- 50 D. Alejo Vázquez Pimentel et al. (2018). *Reward Work, Not Wealth: To End the Inequality Crisis, We Must Build an Economy for Ordinary Working People, Not the Rich and Powerful*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/reward-work-not-wealth-to-end-the-inequality-crisis-we-must-build-an-economy-fo-620396/>
- 51 G. Azcona et al. (2023). *Progress On the Sustainable Development Goals: The Gender Snapshot 2023*. United Nations Women and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2023-09/progress-on-the-sustainable-development-goals-the-gender-snapshot-2023-en.pdf>
- 52 See, e.g. Report to the Human Rights Council. 2019. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance*. undocs.org/A/HRC/41/54; J. Brunner and G. LeBaron. (2021). *Forced Labour Evidence Brief: Labour Share and Value Distribution*. Re:Structure Lab. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6055c0601c885456ba8c962a/t/61d5d81de83cf8390ca5a915/1641404446025/ReStructureLab_LabourShareandValueDistribution_December2021.pdf
- 53 U. Gneiting et al. (2020). *Power, Profits and the Pandemic*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/power-profits-and-pandemic>
- 54 See, e.g. D. Farenthold and T. Smith. (17 January 2023). *How restaurant workers help pay for lobbying to keep their wages low*. *The New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/17/us/politics/restaurant-workers-wages-lobbying.html>; A. Gangitano. (26 January 2021). *Business groups prepare for lobbying push against \$15 minimum wage*. *The Hill*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/535957-business-groups-prepare-for-lobbying-effort-against-raising-the-minimum/>
- 55 See, e.g. The Institution of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH). (n.d.). *UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights: Call for inputs to Multi-stakeholder Consultation on "Corporate Influence in the Political and Regulatory Sphere"*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/2022-06/institution-of-occupational-safety-and-health.pdf>
- 56 E. Walker and C. Rea. (2014). *The Political Mobilization of Firms and Industries*. Department of Sociology, University of California. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043215>
- 57 J. Sherer and N. Mast. (2023). *Child Labor Laws Are Under Attack in States Across the Country*. Economic Policy Institute. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://files.epi.org/uploads/263680.pdf>
- 58 M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest Methodology Note*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/621477/mn-survival-of-the-richest-methodology-160123-en.pdf>; OECD. (2022). *Corporate Tax Statistics: Fourth Edition*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oecd.org/tax/tax-policy/corporate-tax-statistics-fourth-edition.pdf>

- 59 M. Gardner and S. Wamhoff. (2021). *55 Corporations Paid \$0 in Federal Taxes on 2020 Profits*. Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy. <https://itep.org/55-profitable-corporations-zero-corporate-tax/>
- 60 World Bank. (2022). *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2022*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/b96b361a-a806-5567-8e8a-b14392e11fa0/content>; E. Saez and G. Zucman. (2020). *The Triumph of Injustice: How the Rich Dodge Taxes and How to Make Them Pay*. New York City: W. W. Norton & Company.
- 61 M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest: How we must tax the super-rich now to fight inequality*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/survival-of-the-richest-how-we-must-tax-the-super-rich-now-to-fight-inequality-621477/>
- 62 Report to the UN General Assembly. (2018). *Extreme Poverty and Human Rights*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://undocs.org/A/73/396>
- 63 R. Noble. (2018). *From Rhetoric to Rights: Towards Gender-just Trade*. ActionAid. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.actionaid.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/from_rhetoric_to_rights_towards_gender-just_trade_actionaid_policy_briefing.pdf.
- 64 See, e.g. World Bank Group. (2017). *Maximizing Finance for Development: Leveraging the Private Sector for Growth and Sustainable Development*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.devcommittee.org/content/dam/sites/devcommittee/doc/documents/mgr/DC2017-0009_Maximizing_8-19.pdf; USAID. (2018). *Private Sector Engagement Policy*. USAID. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/2022-05/usaid_psepolicy_final.pdf; Eurodad. (2022). *History RePPeated II: Why Public Private Partnerships are not the solution*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://assets.nationbuilder.com/eurodad/pages/3071/attachments/original/1671445992/01_history-rePPeated-2022-EN_19dec.pdf?1671445992
- 65 See, e.g. F. Schulte. (14 November 2022). *Sick profit: Investigating private equity's stealthy takeover of health care across cities and specialties*. KFF Health News. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://kffhealthnews.org/news/article/private-equity-takeover-health-care-cities-specialties/>; The Guardian. (21 May 2023). *The Guardian view on England's water companies: A badly broken system*. The Guardian. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/commentisfree/2023/may/21/the-guardian-view-on-englands-water-companies-a-badly-broken-system>; A. Gupta et al. (2021). *Owner Incentives and Performance in Healthcare: Private Equity Investment in Nursing Homes*. National Bureau of Economic Research. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w28474>
- 66 M. Lawson. (2019). *Public Good or Private Wealth*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/private-wealth-or-public-good-620599/>
- 67 See, e.g. M. Lawson. (2019). *Public good or private wealth*, op. cit.; D. Abed and F. Kelleher, (2022). *The Assault of Austerity*, op. cit.
- 68 See, e.g. G. Wilson et al. (2015). 'Racial Income Inequality and Public Sector Privatization.' *Social Problems*, 62(2), 163–185. <https://academic.oup.com/socpro/article-abstract/62/2/163/1611490?redirectedFrom=fulltext>.
- 69 N. Jadhav and A. Taneja. (2022). *The private health sector in India from the lens of Dalits and Adivasis*. Oxfam India. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfamindia.org/dalitadivasisprivatehospitals>
- 70 A. Taneja and Noopur. (2022). *Private schools in India: Experiences of Dalits and Adivasis*. Oxfam India. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfamindia.org/privateschoolsdalitsadivasis>
- 71 A. Khalfan et al. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 72 A. Maitland et al. (2022). *Carbon Billionaires: The Investment Emissions of the World's Richest People*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/carbon-billionaires-the-investment-emissions-of-the-worlds-richest-people-621446/>
- 73 See, e.g. Influence Map. (2023). *Industry lobbying imbalance putting South Africa's climate goals at risk*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://influencemap.org/site/data/000/021/2023_-_01_South_Africa_report.pdf; J.H. Cushman. (1998). *Industrial group plans to battle climate treaty*. *New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/1998/04/26/us/industrial-group-plans-to-battle-climate-treaty.html>; EarthRights International. (2022). *The Fossil Fuel Industry's use of SLAPPs and Judicial Harassment in the United States*. *Policy Brief*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://earthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/SLAPP-Policy-Brief-2022.pdf>.
- 74 See Forbes: <https://www.forbes.com/real-time-billionaires/#4cc499f13d78>
- 75 UBS. (2023). *Global Wealth Report 2023*. <https://www.ubs.com/global/en/family-office-uhnw/reports/global-wealth-report-2023.html>
- 76 F. Grigoli and A. Robles. (2017). *Inequality Overhang*. IMF. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2017/03/28/Inequality-Overhang-44774>; OECD Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs. (2014). *Does income inequality hurt economic growth?* Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oecd.org/social/Focus-Inequality-and-Growth-2014.pdf>
- 77 The letter is available at <https://equalshope.org/index.php/2023/07/17/setting-serious-goals-to-combat-inequality/>
- 78 M. Doyle and J. Stiglitz. (2014). 'Eliminating Extreme Inequality: A Sustainable Development Goal, 2015–2030'. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 28(1), 5–13. doi:10.1017/S0892679414000021
- 79 This is after the impacts of taxes and social transfers. This ratio is known as the Palma ratio, and this would correspond to a Palma of 1. This equates to the level of equality found in countries such as Denmark and France. The recommendation that all countries should aim for a Palma of one was first made by Michael Doyle and Joseph Stiglitz; see M. Doyle and J. Stiglitz. (2014). 'Eliminating Extreme Inequality: A Sustainable Development Goal, 2015–2030'. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 28(1), 5–13. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ethics-and-international-affairs/article/abs/eliminating-extreme-inequality-a-sustainable-development-goal-20152030/013C79F9BBBE4DCDFE4A5348CEAE05F>
- 80 World Bank Group. *State-Owned Enterprises: Understanding their market effects and the need for competitive neutrality*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/739371594131714315/15444-WB-SOE-WEB.pdf>
- 81 M. Mazzucato and H.L.Li. (2020). 'Is it time to nationalise the pharmaceutical industry?' *BMJ* 2020, 368. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m769>
- 82 T. Wu. (2018). *The Curse of Bigness: Antitrust in the New Gilded Age*. New York City: Columbia Global Reports.
- 83 FTC. (26 September 2023). *FTC Sues Amazon for Illegally maintaining Monopoly power*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/09/ftc-sues-amazon-illegally-maintaining-monopoly-power>
- 84 See methodology note, stat 1.0.
- 85 K. Duggan. (20 July 2021). *Everything to know about Tuesday's Blue Origin space launch with Jeff Bezos*, op. cit.
- 86 D. Streitfeld. (16 March 2021). *How Amazon Crushes Unions*, op. cit.
- 87 Oxfam interview with Reverend Ryan Brown, 4 October 2023.
- 88 Oxfam America. (June 2018). *US Supermarket Supply Chains: Ending the human suffering behind our food*, op. cit.
- 89 Oxfam. (n.d.). *Behind the seafood in our markets: stories of human suffering*, op. cit.

- 90 Oxfam refers to race not as a biological category but as a social construct. The term ‘racialized groups’ refers to groups that do not enjoy the privileges of white people, as a result of the socially constructed process of racialization. A racialized social system is ‘one where economic, political, social and ideological levels are partially structured by the placement of actors in categories or racial groups’. These include discrimination based on ethnicity, caste, Indigeneity or other grounds. In this report, we use the terms ‘race’, ‘racialized groups’ and ‘racialized peoples’, while recognizing the limitations of these terms.
- 91 N. Yonzan et al. (2023). *Poverty is back to pre-COVID levels globally, but not for low-income countries*. World Bank Data blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/poverty-back-pre-covid-levels-globally-not-low-income-countries>
- 92 See methodology note, stat 1.1.
- 93 In 2022, cost-of-living protests occurred in 122 countries and territories, with an estimated three million person-days dedicated to such demonstrations. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.insurancebusinessmag.com/uk/news/breaking-news/costofliving-crisis-inflames-political-unrest--wtw-452396.aspx>; S. Wilkin. (2023). *Political risk index: 2023*. <https://www.wtwco.com/en-ie/insights/2023/07/political-risk-index-summer-23>
- 94 World Bank. (2023). *10: Reduced Inequalities. Progress and setbacks in reducing income inequalities*, op. cit.
- 95 Global Gini 0.62 from World Bank (2023). *10: Reduced Inequalities. Progress and setbacks in reducing income inequalities. Atlas of Sustainable Development Goals 20123*, op. cit.; South Africa Gini 0.63 from World Bank (n.d.) *Databank: Metadata Glossary*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://databank.worldbank.org/metadataglossary/jobs/series/SI.POV.GINI>
- 96 The study shows that although between-country inequality has decreased over the past half-century, there is around 90% likelihood that global warming has slowed that decrease. See S. Diefenbaugh and M. Burke. (2019). ‘Global Warming has Increased Global Economic Inequality’. *PNAS*, 16(20). 9808–9813, <https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1816020116>
- 97 See S. Diefenbaugh and M. Burke. (2019). ‘Global Warming has Increased Global Economic Inequality’, op. cit.
- 98 E. Seery. (2020). *50 years of Broken Promises: The \$5.7 trillion debt owed to the poorest people*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/50-years-of-broken-promises-the-57-trillion-debt-owed-to-the-poorest-people-621080/>
- 99 Oxfam International. (2023). *World’s poorest countries to slash public spending by more than \$220 billion in face of crushing debt*, op. cit.
- 100 A. Kentikelenis et al. (2023). *The Middle East and North Africa Gap: prosperity for the rich, austerity for the rest*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/the-middle-east-and-north-africa-gap-prosperity-for-the-rich-austerity-for-the-621549/>
- 101 Oxfam International. (2023). *World’s poorest countries to slash public spending by more than \$220 billion in face of crushing debt*, op. cit; OECD. (2023). *ODA levels in 2022- preliminary data: Detailed summary note..* Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/ODA-2022-summary.pdf>
- 102 A. Dana and K. Fatimah. (2022). *The Assault of Austerity: How prevailing economic policy choices are a form of gender-based violence*, op. cit.
- 103 A. Wasike. (2023) *Kenya braces for protests against rising cost of living*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/africa/kenya-braces-for-protests-against-rising-cost-of-living/2850175>
- 104 A. Yeo. (2023). *Amazon workers went on their “biggest ever global strike” on Black Friday*. Mashable. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://mashable.com/article/amazon-black-friday-strike-union-workers>
- 105 WTW. (2022). *2022 Political Risk Survey Report*, op. cit.
- 106 M. Pangilinan. (19 June 2023). *Global civil unrest on the rise as cost-of-living crisis intensifies*. Insurance Business. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.insurancebusinessmag.com/us/risk-management/news/global-civil-unrest-on-the-rise-as-costofliving-crisis-intensifies-449683.aspx>
- 107 See methodology note, stat 1.0.
- 108 See methodology note, stat 1.6.
- 109 A principal shareholder is defined by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the USA. A principal shareholder’s voting shares allow the shareholder to vote on who should be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or who would sit on the company’s board of directors. Investopedia. (2022). *Principal Shareholder: Meaning, Requirements, Primary Shareholder*. Accessed 29 November 2023.
- 110 See methodology note, stat 3.0.
- 111 See methodology note, stat 1.4. Whilst using the term ‘men’ and ‘women’ throughout this report to describe the gender divide amongst billionaires, based largely on categorisations used in the Forbes billionaires list and other secondary data sources, we recognise that these are binary terms and may fail to capture and represent non-binary and other gender non-conforming people, for whom disaggregated data on wealth are unavailable, which prevents us from fully understanding gender-based wealth inequalities.
- 112 See methodology note, stat 1.8.
- 113 A. Khalifan et al. (2023). *Climate Equality: A Planet for the 99%*, op. cit.
- 114 A. Aladangady, A.C. Chang and J. Krimmel. (2023). *Greater wealth, greater uncertainty: Changes in racial inequality in the survey of consumer finances*, op. cit.
- 115 Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. (2019). *Desigualdades Sociais por Cor ou Raça no Brasil* (Portuguese), op. cit.
- 116 See methodology note, stat 2.3.
- 117 See methodology note, stat 1.7.
- 118 See methodology note, stat 1.2.
- 119 UBS. (2023). *World Wealth Report*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ubs.com/global/en/family-office-uhnw/reports/global-wealth-report-2023.html>
- 120 See methodology note, stat 1.5.
- 121 See methodology note, stat 1.3.
- 122 A. Fleck. (11 September 2023). *Where the World’s Ultra Wealthy Reside*. statista. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.statista.com/chart/30792/number-of-people-with-an-ultra-high-net-worth/>
- 123 U. Patnaik. (2017). ‘Revisiting the “Drain”, or Transfer from India to Britain in the Context of Global Diffusion of Capitalism’ in S. Chakrabarti and U. Patnaik (eds.) *Agrarian and Other Histories: Essays for Binay Bhushan Chaudhuri*. New Delhi: Tulika Books.
- 124 M. Desmond. (19 August 2014). *In order to understand the brutality of American capitalism, you have to start on the plantation*. *The New York Times Magazine*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/14/magazine/slavery-capitalism.html>

- 125 M.L.M. Fletcher. (20 October 2021). 'Systemic Racism and the Dispossession of Indigenous Wealth in the United States'. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3946559
- 126 Wilkins, M. (1998). Multinational Corporations: An Historical Account. In: Kozul-Wright, R., Rowthorn, R. (eds) *Transnational Corporations and the Global Economy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26523-7_4
- 127 See methodology note, stat 1.3.
- 128 See Forbes: <https://www.forbes.com/real-time-billionaires/#4cc499f13d78>
- 129 UBS. (2023). Global Wealth Report 2023. <https://www.ubs.com/global/en/family-office-uhnw/reports/global-wealth-report-2023.html>
- 130 See, e.g. F. Grigoli and A. Robles. (2017). *Inequality Overhang*, op. cit.; OECD Directorate for Employment, Labour and Social Affairs. (2014). *Does income inequality hurt economic growth?* op. cit.
- 131 The letter is available at <https://equalshope.org/index.php/2023/07/17/setting-serious-goals-to-combat-inequality/>
- 132 M. Doyle and J. Stiglitz. (2014). 'Eliminating Extreme Inequality: A Sustainable Development Goal, 2015–2030', op. cit.
- 133 This is after the impacts of taxes and social transfers. This ratio is known as the Palma ratio, and this would correspond to a Palma of 1. This equates to the level of equality found in countries such as Denmark and France. The recommendation that all countries should aim for a Palma of 1 was first made by Michael Doyle and Joseph Stiglitz; see: M. Doyle and J. Stiglitz. (2014). 'Eliminating Extreme Inequality: A Sustainable Development Goal, 2015–2030', op.cit.
- 134 J. Bivens and J. Kandra. (2023). *CEO pay slightly declined in 2022*. Economic Policy Institute. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.epi.org/publication/ceo-pay-in-2022/>
- 135 Oxfam. (2023). *Corporation windfall profits rocket to \$1 trillion a year*. Accessed 1 December 2023. [https://www.oxfam.org.uk/media/press-releases/corporation-windfall-profits-rocket-to-1-trillion-a-year/#:~:text=Analysis%20by%20Oxfam%20and%20ActionAid,average%20\(2017%2D2020\)](https://www.oxfam.org.uk/media/press-releases/corporation-windfall-profits-rocket-to-1-trillion-a-year/#:~:text=Analysis%20by%20Oxfam%20and%20ActionAid,average%20(2017%2D2020))
- 136 For all figures in this paragraph, see methodology note, stat 2.0.
- 137 See methodology note, stat 2.0.
- 138 See methodology note, stat 2.1.
- 139 Exerica: <https://exerica.com/>
- 140 L. Wier and H. Reynolds. (2018). *Big and "unprofitable": How 10 per cent of multinational firms do 98 per cent of profit shifting*. UNU WIDER. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.wider.unu.edu/publication/big-and-%E2%80%98unprofitable%E2%80%99>
- 141 L. Angeles. (2007). *Income inequality and colonialism*. European Economic Review., 51(5), 1155–1176. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S001429210600122X>
- 142 DFA: Distributional Financial Accounts. (2023). *Distribution of Household Wealth in the US since 1989*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/z1/dataviz/dfa/distribute/chart/#range:2021.4,2023.1;quarter:134;series:Corporate%20equities%20and%20mutual%20fund%20shares;demographic:race:population:all;units:shares>
- 143 A. Changole. (31 July 2022). *Black Ownership of South African Businesses fall below 30%*. Bloomberg. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-07-31/black-ownership-of-south-african-businesses-falls-below-30?cmpid=socialflow-twitter-business>
- 144 D. Halim. (2020) *Women entrepreneurs needed- stat!* World Bank Data Blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/women-entrepreneurs-needed-stat>
- 145 A. Charpin et al. (2023). 'Female corporate owners and Female CEOs'. *Economics Letters*, 232. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0165176523003105>
- 146 DFA: Distributional Financial Accounts. (2023). *Distribution of Household Wealth in the US since 1989*. Accessed 31 December 2023. <https://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/z1/dataviz/dfa/distribute/chart/#range:2021.4,2023.1;quarter:134;series:Corporate%20equities%20and%20mutual%20fund%20shares;demographic:networth;population:all;units:shares>
- 147 G. Reuten. (2023). 'On the distribution of wealth and capital ownership: An empirical application to OECD Countries around 2019'. *Brill*. <https://brill.com/view/journals/hima/aop/article-10.1163-1569206x-bja10005/article-10.1163-1569206x-bja10005.xml?language=en>
- 148 A. Chatterjee et al. (2020). 'Estimating the distribution of household wealth in South Africa'. UNU WIDER Working paper 45/2020. <https://www.wider.unu.edu/publication/estimating-distribution-household-wealth-south-africa>
- 149 D. Bhering and F. Avila de Castro. (2023). *Wealth Inequality in Brazil*. HAL open science. <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04166852/document>
- 150 See methodology note, stat 1.9.
- 151 N. Lusiani and E. DiVito. (7 November 2022). Billionaire market power: How could an individual wealth tax curb corporate consolidation in the US? Tax Justice Network. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://taxjustice.net/2022/11/07/billionaire-market-power-how-could-an-individual-wealth-tax-curb-corporate-consolidation-in-the-us/>
- 152 Ibid.
- 153 See methodology note, Section 3.
- 154 See methodology note, Section 3.
- 155 M. Johnston. *Investopedia Company Profiles: Walmart - Top Walmart Shareholders*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/insights/060416/top-4-walmart-shareholders-wmt.asp>
- 156 See Bloomberg Billionaires Index: <https://www.bloomberg.com/billionaires/profiles/low-t-kwong/>
- 157 ESCR-Net. Manifestations of corporate capture. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.escr-net.org/corporateaccountability/corporatecapture/manifestations-corporate-capture>
- 158 See, e.g. in healthcare: P. Milson et al. (2021). 'Corporate power and the international trade regime preventing progressive policy action on non-communicable diseases: a realistic review'. *Health policy and planning*. 36(4). <https://academic.oup.com/heapol/article/36/4/493/6024433>
- 159 L. Elsässer et al. (2018). 'Government of the people, by the elite, for the rich: Unequal responsiveness in an unlikely case'. MPIfG Discussion Paper, No. 18/5. Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, Cologne. <https://hdl.handle.net/21.11116/0000-0001-759D-B>
- 160 D. Krmaric et al. (2023). 'Billionaire Politicians: A global perspective.' *Perspective on Politics*, First view, 1–15. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/billionaire-politicians-a-global-perspective/1AD0E0C33FE43165B14DD981533E00DD>

- 161 M. Persoon and A. Sundell. (2023). 'The Rich have a slight edge: Evidence from Comparative Data on Income-Based Inequality in Policy Congruence' *British Journal of Political Science*, First view, 1–12. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/british-journal-of-political-science/article/rich-have-a-slight-edge-evidence-from-comparative-data-on-incomebased-inequality-in-policy-congruence/A09095FC0874B162149014212872BE86>
- 162 This new era has arisen since the 1980s. See, 'Rising Corporate Market Power: Emerging Policy Issues', IMF Staff Discussion Notes 2021/001, International Monetary Fund. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/Staff-Discussion-Notes/Issues/2021/03/10/Rising-Corporate-Market-Power-Emerging-Policy-Issues-48619>; UNCTAD. (2017). Trade and Development Report 2017. *Beyond Austerity: Towards A Global New Deal*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/trd2017_en.pdf
- 163 Eeckhout, Jan. *The Profit Paradox: How Thriving Firms Threaten the Future of Work*, op. cit.
- 164 Z. Teachout. (2020). *Break 'em Up: Recovering Our Freedom from Big Ag, Big Tech, and Big Money*. New York City: All Points Books.
- 165 Federal Trade Commission. *Monopolization Defined*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ftc.gov/advice-guidance/competition-guidance/guide-antitrust-laws/single-firm-conduct/monopolization-defined>
- 166 See further analysis and detail on this in 'Taken, not earned: How monopolists drive the world's power and wealth divide', Balanced Economy Project, SOMO and Global Justice Now (forthcoming, January 2024).
- 167 W. Chen et al. (2019). *World Economic Outlook, April 2019 Growth Slowdown, Precarious Recovery*. Chapter 2: 'The Rise of Corporate Market Power and Its Macroeconomic Effects'. International Monetary Fund. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/-/media/Files/Publications/WE0/2019/April/English/ch2.ashx>
- 168 L. Khan and S. Vaheesan. (2017). *Market Power and Inequality: The Antitrust Counterrevolution and Its Discontents*, 11 *Harvard Law & Policy Review*, 235. Columbia Law School Faculty Publications Scholarship Archive. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/faculty_scholarship/2790; See J.B. Baker and S.C. Salop. (2015). 'Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Inequality', *Georgetown Law Journal*, 104(1), 128. <https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/1462/>
- 169 A. Velasquez. (2023). *Production Technology, Market Power, and the Decline of the Labor Share*. International Monetary Fund Paper No. 23/32. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2023/02/10/Production-Technology-Market-Power-and-the-Dcline-of-the-Labor-Share-529699>
- 170 T. Babina et al. (2023). *Antitrust Enforcement Increases Economic Activity*. National Bureau of Economic Research. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w31597>
- 171 C. Decker et al. (2022). 'Competition Law Enforcement and Household Inequality in the United Kingdom'. *Journal of Competition Law & Economics*, 18(4), 905–35. <https://academic.oup.com/jcle/article/18/4/905/6604438>; A.Ezrachi et al. (2023). 'The Effects of Competition Law on Inequality—An Incidental By-product or a Path for Societal Change?'. *Journal of Antitrust Enforcement*, 11(1), 51–73. <https://academic.oup.com/antitrust/article/11/1/51/6593927>
- 172 Amnesty International. (21 November 2019). *Facebook and Google's pervasive surveillance poses an unprecedented danger to human rights*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/2019/11/google-facebook-surveillance-privacy/>
- 173 Z. Teachout. (2020). *Break 'em Up: Recovering Our Freedom from Big Ag, Big Tech, and Big Money*, op.cit.
- 174 Ibid.; N. Abernathy et al. (2019). *New Rules for the 21st Century: Corporate Power, Public Power, and the Future of the American Economy*. Roosevelt Institute; A. Merelli. (28 May 2021). *Big pharma wants you to think sharing vaccine patents overseas is very dangerous*. Quartz. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://qz.com/2013661/big-pharma-argues-poor-nations-cant-be-trusted-to-make-vaccines/>; Oxfam. (2022). *Inequality kills: The unparalleled action needed to combat unprecedented inequality in the wake of COVID-19*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/621341/bp-inequality-kills-170122-en.pdf?sequence=9> https://rooseveltinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/RI_2021-Report_201904.pdf
- 175 Ibid.
- 176 M. Fox. (2023). *Apple just eclipsed a \$3 trillion valuation: Here are 8 things the iPhone maker is now bigger than, including France's economy and India's entire stock market*. Business Insider India. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.businessinsider.in/stock-market/news/apple-just-eclipsed-a-3-trillion-valuation-here-are-8-things-the-iphone-maker-is-now-bigger-than-including-frances-economy-and-indias-entire-stock-market-/articleshow/101420192.cms>
- 177 See methodology note, stat 2.11.
- 178 EY. (29 December 2022). *US companies are dominating stock exchanges globally*. Press release. EY. https://www.ey.com/en_ch/news/2022-press-releases/12/us-companies-are-dominating-stock-exchanges-globally
- 179 I.M. Weber and E. Wasner. (2023). 'Sellers' Inflation, Profits and Conflict: Why can Large Firms Hike Prices in an Emergency? op. cit.
- 180 European Central Bank. (25 August 2023). *Structural Shifts in the Global Economy*. Speech by Christine Lagarde, President of the ECB, at the annual Economic Policy Symposium, organized by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City in Jackson Hole. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2023/html/ecb.sp230825-7771105fe.en.html>; N. Hansen et al. (26 June 2023). *Europe's inflation outlook depends on how corporate profits absorb wage gains*. IMF blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2023/06/26/europes-inflation-outlook-depends-on-how-corporate-profits-absorb-wage-gains>
- 181 J. Ghosh. (8 June 2023). 'The Social Consequences of Inflation in Developing Countries.' *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 34(2), 203–11. <https://doi.org/10.1017/etl.2023.11>
- 182 J. De Loecker and J. Eeckhout. (2021). *Global Market Power*. <https://www.janeeckhout.com/wp-content/uploads/Global.pdf>; The Balanced Economy (2021). *Europe's monopoly problem... and the missing trillions*. The Counterbalance: An anti-monopoly newsletter. <https://thecounterbalance.substack.com/p/europes-monopoly-problem>; J. De Loecker and J. Eeckhout. (2017). *The Rise of Market Power and the Macroeconomic Implications*. National Bureau Economic Research Working Paper No. w23687. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3023087#
- 183 L. Wier and G. Zucman. (2022). 'Global Profit Shifting, 1975–2019'. UNU-WIDER Working Paper. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.wider.unu.edu/node/240777>
- 184 Ibid. The data for the analysis can be accessed in 'Data F3' tab in <https://www.wider.unu.edu/sites/default/files/Publications/Working-paper/wp2022-121-WZ2022-data-appendix.xlsx>
- 185 Between 1995 and 2015, the average market capitalization of the world's top 100 firms rose from 31 times to 7,000 times that of the bottom 2,000 firms, based on a UN database of consolidated financial statements of listed non-financial companies in 56 high-income and low- and middle-income countries. UNCTAD. (2017). Trade and Development Report 2017. *Beyond Austerity: Towards A Global New Deal*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://unctad.org/publication/trade-and-development-report-2017>.
- 186 Federal Trade Commission. (26 September 2023). *FTC sues Amazon for illegally maintaining monopoly power*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/09/ftc-sues-amazon-illegally-maintaining-monopoly-power>
- 187 T. Pang et al. (2020). *Study on the Impact of Mergers and Acquisitions on Innovation in the Pharmaceutical Sector*. European Commission Publications Office. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c6540f08-a16f-11e9-9d01-01aa75ed71a1>

- 188 ETC Group. (2022). *Food Barons 2022*. https://www.etcgroup.org/files/files/food-barons-2022-full_sectors-final_16_sept.pdf; S. Wixforth and K. Haddouti. (19 December 2022). *How big companies are profiting from inflation*. International Politics and Society blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ips-journal.eu/topics/economy-and-ecology/how-big-companies-are-profiting-from-inflation-6388/>;
- 189 ETC Group. (2022). *Food Barons 2022*, op. cit.
- 190 Ibid.
- 191 S. Joseph. (4 February 2022). *The Rundown: Google, Meta and Amazon are on track to absorb more than 50% of all ad money in 2022*. Digiday. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://digiday.com/marketing/the-rundown-google-meta-and-amazon-are-on-track-to-absorb-more-than-50-of-all-ad-money-in-2022/>
- 192 SimilarWeb. (2023). *Search Engines Market Share* (June 2023). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.similarweb.com/engines/>; D. McCabe. and N. Grant. (11 September 2013). *Google Goes on Trial Over Justice Dept. Claims That It Has Monopoly Power*. *The New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/09/11/technology/google-monopoly-justice-dept-trial.html>
- 193 International Accounting Bulletin. (4 May 2021). *Accounting giants continue to dominate the market despite pandemic*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.internationalaccountingbulletin.com/news/accounting-giants/>
- 194 S. Robert. (2023). 'Competition, Trade, and Sustainability in Agriculture and Food Markets in Africa.' *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 39(1), 147–61. <https://academic.oup.com/oxrep/article-abstract/39/1/147/7030599?redirectedFrom=fulltext>; V. Acharya. (2023). *India at 75: Replete with Contradictions, Brimming with Opportunities, Saddled with Challenges*. Paper presented at a conference on the Brookings Paper on Economic Activity, 30–31 March 2023. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/BPEA_Spring2023_EM-Panel_Acharya_unembargoed_updated.pdf
- 195 B. Hoffman. (2013). *Behind the Brands: Food Justice and the 'Big 10' food and beverage companies*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/behind-the-brands-food-justice-and-the-big-10-food-and-beverage-companies-270393>; Krista Brown. (25 February 2020). *Illusion of Choice*. American Economic Liberties Project. <https://www.economicliberties.us/our-work/the-illusion-of-choice/>
- 196 Anheuser-Busch InBev website. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ab-inbev.com/our-brands/>
- 197 J. McLeod. (7 February 2020). *Inside the kill zone: Big Tech makes life miserable for some startups, but others embrace its power*. *Financial Post*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://financialpost.com/technology/inside-the-kill-zone-big-tech-makes-life-miserable-for-some-startups-but-others-embrace-its-power>; Balanced Economy Project. (16 December 2022). *How finance drives monopoly power*. The Counterbalance. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://thecounterbalance.substack.com/p/how-finance-drives-monopoly-power?utm_source=profile&utm_medium=reader2
- 198 R. Willoughby and T. Gore. (2018). *Ripe for Change: Ending Human Suffering in Supermarket Supply Chains*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/file_attachments/cr-ripe-for-change-supermarket-supply-chains-210618-en.pdf
- 199 The Economist. (2 May 2023). *The 2023 crony-capitalism index*. The Economist News. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.economist.com/international/2023/05/02/the-2023-crony-capitalism-index>
- 200 M. Spencer. (13 April 2023). *LVMH's caution points to Americans' waning lust for luxury*. Reuters. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.reuters.com/business/retail-consumer/lvmhs-caution-points-americans-waning-lust-luxury-2023-04-13>
- 201 G. Deeny. (12 July 2023). *LVMH buys Vuitton superstore building on Champs Elysées, amid Paris real estate buying spree*. Fashion Network. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.fashionnetwork.com/news/Lvmh-buys-vuitton-superstore-building-on-champs-elysees-amid-paris-real-estate-buying-sprees-1535528.html>
- 202 Reuters. (22 July 2021). *French antitrust body fines eyewear makers for imposing selling prices*. Reuters. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.euronews.com/next/2021/07/22/uk-france-antitrust-eyewear-makers>
- 203 L. Khan. (2017). 'Amazon's Antitrust Paradox'. 126 YALE L.J. 710: Columbia Law School Faculty Publications Scholarship Archive. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3813&context=faculty_scholarship
- 204 The Economist. (2016). *The 1.2 Billion Opportunity*. Special Report: Business in Africa. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.economist.com/sites/default/files/20160416_africa.pdf
- 205 C. Nwanze. (20 March 2021). *Of Dangote and Near Absolute Monopolies*. Premium Times, Nigeria. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/opinion/450128-of-dangote-and-near-absolute-monopolies-by-cheta-nwanze.html>; F. Fawehinmi. (11 October 2017). *Africa's richest man has a built-in advantage with Nigeria's government*. Quartz. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://qz.com/africa/1098137/africas-richest-man-has-a-built-in-advantage-with-nigerias-government#:~:text=Dangote%20Cement's%2065%25%20share%20of,just%20under%2050%25%20in%202016>
- 206 The World Bank Group (2016). *Breaking Down Barriers: Unlocking Africa's Potential through Vigorous Competition Policy*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2016/07/27/africa-competition>
- 207 A. Kingsley Jeremiah. (4 June 2023). *Grappling with challenges, monopoly fears, others posed by Dangote Refinery*. *The Guardian, Nigeria*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://guardian.ng/features/grappling-with-challenges-monopoly-fears-others-posed-by-dangote-refinery/>
- 208 B. Schmidt and J. Attwood. (23 June 2022). *Lithium king's \$3.5 billion fortune now facing government threat*. Bloomberg. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2022-06-23/lithium-king-crowned-in-dictatorship-sees-3-5-billion-fortune-at-risk>
- 209 K. Bryan and M. Stott. (2023). *Chile's president moves to bring lithium under state control*. *Financial Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ft.com/content/ebd46bbc-1390-4679-99fe-682975bbdba8>.
- 210 L. Lopez. (10 November 2019). *Softbank is getting exactly what it deserves, and it's thanks to something way bigger than WeWork*. *Insider*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.businessinsider.com/softbank-crashing-investments-uber-wework-monopoly-failure-2019-11>; Open Markets. (28 June 2018). *Fighting against monopoly: SoftBank's market power machine — AT&T moves to manipulate*. The Corner Newsletter. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.openmarketsinstitute.org/publications/corner-newsletter-june-28-2018-fighting-monopoly-softbanks-market-power-machine-att-moves-manipulate>; T. Bradshaw et al. (2023). *SoftBank's Arm unveils plans for biggest US IPO in nearly 2 years*. *Financial Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ft.com/content/36bc706f-66a1-48e3-8c20-ab4966cb0fce>
- 211 F. Ledley et al. (2 September 2020). *US tax dollars funded every new pharmaceutical in the last decade*. Institute for New Economic Thinking. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ineteconomics.org/perspectives/blog/us-tax-dollars-funded-every-new-pharmaceutical-in-the-last-decade>
- 212 R.E. Barenie et al. (2021). 'Public funding for transformative drugs: the case of sofosbuvir'. *Drug Discovery Today*. 26(1), 273–281. doi: 10.1016/j.drudis.2020.09.024.
- 213 R. Pearl. (31 January 2023). *Pharma companies: A conglomerate of monopolies*. Forbes. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/robertpearl/2023/01/31/pharma-companies-a-conglomerate-of-monopolies/?sh=7cdd83201ce1>
- 214 S. Moore et al. (2022) 'Retrospectively modeling the effects of increased global vaccine sharing on the COVID-19 pandemic'. *Nat Med*. 28, 2416–2423. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-02064-y>

- 215 R. Malpani and A. Maitland. (2021). *Dose of Reality: How Rich Countries and Pharmaceutical Corporations Are Breaking Their Vaccine Promises*. The People's Vaccine. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://webassets.oxfamamerica.org/media/documents/A_Dose_of_Reality-Briefing_Note_k0W1yUs.pdf
- 216 B. Braun. (2021). *Exit, Control, and Politics: The Structural Power of Finance Under Asset Manager Capitalism*. SocArXiv. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/4uesq>; J. Coates. (20 September 2018). *The Future of Corporate Governance Part I: The Problem of Twelve*. Harvard Public Law Working Paper No. 19-07. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3247337; Gabor, D. (2021). 'The Wall Street Consensus'. *Development and Change*, 52: 429–459. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12645>
- 217 D. Hearn et al. (2022). *The Roll-Up Economy: The Business of Consolidating Industries with Serial Acquisitions*. *American Economic Liberties Project*, op. cit.; Balanced Economy Project. (19 November 2021). *How finance drives monopoly*. The Counterbalance. Accessed 1 December 2023; Bain & Company. (2019). *Global Private Equity Report 2019*. Bain & Company, Inc. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.bain.com/contentassets/875a49e26e9c4775942ec5b86084df0a/bain_report_private_equity_report_2019.pdf; Center for Economic and Policy Research (2022). *Comment Letter in Response to the FTC and DOJ's Request for Information on Merger Enforcement*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://cepr.net/comment-letter-in-response-to-the-ftc-and-doj-s-request-for-information-on-merger-enforcement/>
- 218 R. Kerber. (2023). *Blackrock to expand proxy voting choice to retail ETF investors*. Reuters. Accessed 28 November 2023. <https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/blackrock-expand-proxy-voting-choice-retail-etf-investors-2023-07-17/>.
- 219 E. Elhaug. (9 April 2020). 'How Horizontal Shareholding Harms Our Economy – And Why Antitrust Law Can Fix It'. *Harvard Business Law Review*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3293822; D. McLaughlin and A. Massa. (9 January 2020). *The hidden dangers of the great index fund takeover*. Bloomberg. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2020-01-09/the-hidden-dangers-of-the-great-index-fund-takeover>
- 220 Total assets under management \$98 trillion as of May 2023. See BCG press releases (15 May 2023). *Global Asset Management Industry Must Transform to Thrive Amidst Changing Macroeconomics*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bcg.com/press/15may2023-global-asset-management-transform-to-thrive>
- 221 J. Azar, M.C. Schmalz and I. Tecu. (2018). 'Anti-Competitive Effects of Common Ownership'. *Journal of Finance*, 73(4). <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jofi.12698>; M. Antón et al. (2023). 'Common Ownership, Competition, and Top Management Incentives', *Journal of Political Economy*, 131(5), 1294–1355. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w30785>
- 222 J. Coates. (2018). 'The Future of Corporate Governance Part I', op. cit.; J. Bogle. (29 November 2018). *Bogle Sounds a Warning on Index Funds*. *Wall Street Journal*. Accessed 1 December 2023. www.wsj.com/articles/bogle-sounds-a-warning-on-index-funds-1543504551. Accessed 2023.
- 223 United Nations, Inter-agency Task Force on Financing for Development. (2023) *Financing for Sustainable Development Report 2023: Financing Sustainable Transformations*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://desapublications.un.org/publications/financing-sustainable-development-report-2023>.
- 224 A. Fisher. (11 May 2021). *The rising financialization of the U.S. economy harms workers and their families, threatening a strong recovery*. Washington Center for Equitable Growth. <https://equitablegrowth.org/the-rising-financialization-of-the-u-s-economy-harms-workers-and-their-families-threatening-a-strong-recovery/>
- 225 K. Tretina. (11 January 2023). *How to Invest in Hedge Funds*. *Forbes Advisor*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.forbes.com/advisor/investing/how-to-invest-in-hedge-funds/>
- 226 M.R. DesJardine, E. Marti and R. Durand. (2021). 'Why Activist Hedge Funds Target Socially Responsible Firms: The Reaction Costs of Signaling Corporate Social Responsibility'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(3), 851–872. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2019.0238>
- 227 'Buy, strip and flip' is a phrase used to describe the practice of private equity firms buying undervalued companies, stripping them down and then selling off the restructured entity a short time later in an initial public offering (IPO). D. Liberto. (2021). *Buy, Strip and Flip. What It Is, How It Works*. Investopedia. Accessed 4 December 2023. [https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/bsf.asp#:~:text=Buy%2C%20strip%20and%20flip%20is,initial%20public%20offering%20\(IPO\)](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/bsf.asp#:~:text=Buy%2C%20strip%20and%20flip%20is,initial%20public%20offering%20(IPO))
- 228 A. Edgecliffe-Johnson. (2018). *Unilever chief admits Kraft Heinz bid forced compromises*. *Financial Times* [online]. Accessed 4 December 2023. <https://www.ft.com/content/ea0218ce-1be0-11e8-aaca-4574d7dabfb6..>
- 229 S. Aramonte and F. Avalos. (2021). 'The rise of private markets'. *BIS Quarterly review*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt2112e.htm
- 230 N. Lee and A. Sami. (2019). 'Trends in Private Capital Flows to Low-Income Countries: Good and Not-so-good news'. CGD Policy Paper 151. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/trends-private-capital-flows-low-income-countries-good-and-not-so-good-news.pdf>
- 231 L. Fox, D. Kritzberg and M. Nicholson. (2022). 'Are private equity investments financing the SDGs in Sub-Saharan Africa?' Africa Growth Initiative at Brookings report. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/Fox-Kritzberg-Nicholson-2023.pdf>
- 232 M. Soener. (2022). 'Financialization goes South: Foreign capital flows and financial accumulation in emerging markets'. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 64(4). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00207152221133058?icid=int.sj-abstract.citing-articles.4>
- 233 W.L. Makler and W.L. Ness. (2002). 'How financial intermediation challenges national sovereignty in emerging markets'. *Economics & Finance*, 42(5), 827–851. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1062976902001412>
- 234 D. Roos. (23 October 2020). *How the East India Company became the world's most powerful monopoly*. *History*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.history.com/news/east-india-company-england-trade>
- 235 T. Wu. (2018). 'The Curse of Bigness: Antitrust in the New Gilded Age'. New York City: Columbia Global Reports.
- 236 A. Griswold. (11 November 2019). *Why is it called antitrust?* Quartz. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://qz.com/1732014/why-is-it-called-antitrust/>; E. Goldschein. (19 December 2011). *The incredible story of how De Beers created and lost the most powerful monopoly ever*. *Insider*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.businessinsider.com/history-of-de-beers-2011-12>
- 237 M. Meagher. (14 July 2020). 'Corporate Law, Antitrust, and the History of Democratic Control of the Balance of Power' in Nowag and Corradi (eds.). *The Intersections between Competition Law and Corporate Law and Finance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3622266>
- 238 N. Glynn and N. Dearden. (2023). *Monopoly Capitalism: What is it and how do we fight it?* Global Justice Now. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.globaljustice.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Monopoly-capitalism-primer-WEB-FINAL.pdf>; 'The new generation of monopolies: time to break them up?', Balanced Economy Project [forthcoming]; Secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2017). *Trade and Development Report 2017*. UN. Accessed 2023. <https://unctad.org/publication/trade-and-development-report-2017>; S. Welton. (2021). 'Revamping Public Energy' in G. Sitaraman & A. Alstott (eds.), *Politics, Policy, and Public Options* (134–152). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108767552.009 <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/politics-policy-and-public-options/revamping-public-energy/2FA2D637C64A2B19915F2DF83617B166>
- 239 M. Meagher. (2020). *Competition is Killing Us: How Big Business is Harming Our Society and Planet – and What To Do About It*. London: Penguin.
- 240 T. Brennan. (2015). 'Kwoka, John E.: Mergers, merger control, and remedies: a retrospective analysis of U.S. policy'. *CHOICE: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries*, 52(12), 2065+. Gale Academic OneFile Select. Accessed 12 October 2023. link.gale.com/apps/doc/A424530551/EAIM?u=anon-c65b6250&sid=sitemap&xid=2688957f

- 241 M. Stoller. (2020). *Goliath: The 100-Year War Between Monopoly Power and Democracy*. New York City: Simon & Schuster.
- 242 J. Hickel et al. (2022). 'Imperialist appropriation in the world economy: Drain from the global South through unequal exchange, 1990–2015'. *Global Environmental Change*, 73:102467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2022.102467>
- 243 Z. Teachout. (2020). *Break 'Em Up*, op. cit.
- 244 M. Meagher. (2020). *Competition is Killing Us*, op. cit. p.54: 'Too Big to Regulate'.
- 245 F. D. Roosevelt. (1938). Message to Congress on Curbing Monopolies. The American Presidency Project. UC Santa Barbara. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/message-congress-curbing-monopolies>
- 246 S. Allende. (2022) 'Enough — no more dependence!' Transcript of President Allende speech at the United Nations General Assembly on the eve of 4 December 1972. Progressive International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://progressive.international/blueprint/4243ea84-7ec0-464b-a0c2-ec677e79a456-salvador-allende-enough--no-more-dependence/en>
- 247 D. Kilpatrick. (2018). *The Facebook Defect*. *Time*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://time.com/5237458/the-facebook-defect/>
- 248 OECD. (2021). *OECD Compendium of Productivity Indicators 2023*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/industry-and-services/oecd-compendium-of-productivity-indicators-2023_74623e5b-en#page54
- 249 International Labour Organization. (2023). *Global Wage Report 2022–2023: The impact of inflation and COVID-19 on wages and purchasing power*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://researchrepository.ilo.org/esploro/outputs/report/995264896002676>
- 250 See methodology note, stat 2.3.
- 251 United Nations General Assembly. (2023). *Extreme Poverty and Human Rights*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <Undocs.org/A/78/175>
- 252 D. Alejo Vázquez Pimentel et al. (2018). *Reward Work, Not Wealth*, op. cit.
- 253 International Labour Organization. (2016). *Non-standard Employment Around the World: Understanding Challenges, Shaping Prospects*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://ilo.org/global/publications/books/WCMS_534326/lang--en/index.htm
- 254 International Labour Organization. (n.d.). *Occupational safety and health: World Statistic*. Accessed 6 September 2023. https://www.ilo.org/moscow/areas-of-work/occupational-safety-and-health/WCMS_249278/lang--en/index.htm#:~:text=The%20ILO%20estimates%20that%20some,of%20work%2Drelated%20illnesses%20annually
- 255 International Labour Organization, Walk Free and International Organization for Migration. (2022). *Global Estimates of Modern Slavery: Forced Labour and Forced Marriage*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_854733.pdf
- 256 A. Ezrachi et al. (2022). 'The Effects of Competition Law on Inequality', op. cit.
- 257 D. Alejo Vázquez Pimentel et al. (2018). *Reward Work, Not Wealth*, op. cit.
- 258 Z. Darvas. (2023). *Collective bargaining is associated with lower income inequality*. bruegel. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bruegel.org/analysis/collective-bargaining-associated-lower-income-inequality>
- 259 International Trade Union Confederation. (2023). *2023 ITUC Global Rights Index*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/2023_ituc_global_rights_index_en.pdf
- 260 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (n.d.). *Trade unions, employer organisations, and collective bargaining in OECD countries*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oecd.org/els/emp/Flyer-Collective%20bargaining.pdf>; International Labour Organization. (2022). *Social Dialogue Report 2022: Collective bargaining for an inclusive, sustainable and resilient recovery*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_842807.pdf
- 261 Reuters. (20 March 2023). *Content moderators sue Meta over alleged 'union-busting' in Kenya*. Reuters. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/content-moderators-sue-meta-over-alleged-union-busting-kenya-2023-03-20/>; Business and Human Rights Resource Centre. (14 July 2020). *Bangladesh: HSM and Inditex supplier accused of union busting amid COVID-19 after dismissal of 3,000 garment workers; Incl. company responses*. Business and Human Rights Resource Centre. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/latest-news/bangladesh-hm-and-inditex-supplier-accused-of-union-busting-amid-covid-19-after-dismissal-of-3000-garment-workers-incl-company-responses/>; S. Greenhouse. (26 February 2023). *Old-school union busting: how US corporations are quashing the new wave of organizing*. *The Guardian*. Accessed 1 December 2023. [https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/feb/26/amazon-trader-joes-starbucks-anti-union-measures#:~:text=US%20corporations%20have%20mounted%20a,significantly%20drain%20the%20momentum%20behind](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/feb/26/amazon-trader-joes-starbucks-anti-union-measures#:~:text=US%20corporations%20have%20mounted%20a,significantly%20drain%20the%20momentum%20behind;); L. Fang. (7 June 2022). *The evolution of union-busting*. *The Intercept*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://theintercept.com/2022/06/07/union-busting-tactics-diversity/>
- 262 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Trade Unions*, op. cit.
- 263 See methodology note, stat 2.4.
- 264 I. Karbal. (21 August 2020). *Uber and Lyft boost lobbying power as they threaten to pull out of California*. Open Secrets. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.opensecrets.org/news/2020/08/uber-lyft-boost-lobby-california/>; B. Medina and N. Sadek. (2 August 2022). *Highlights from Uber Files reporting around the globe*. International Consortium of Investigative Journalists. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.icij.org/investigations/uber-files/highlights-from-uber-files-reporting-around-the-globe/>
- 265 E. Walker and C. Rea. (2014). *The Political Mobilization*, op. cit.
- 266 J. Tapper. (30 November 2020). *NYT: Nike, Coca-Cola accused of lobbying against anti-forced labor bill*. CNN. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.cnn.com/videos/tv/2020/11/30/lead-nike-coke-forced-labor-live-jake-tapper.cnn>
- 267 D. Farenthold and T. Smith. (17 January 2023). *How Restaurant Workers*, op. cit.; A. Gangitano. (26 January 2021). *Business groups prepare for lobbying push against \$15 minimum wage*. *The Hill*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/535957-business-groups-prepare-for-lobbying-effort-against-raising-the-minimum/>
- 268 J. Sherer and N. Mast. (2023). *Child Labor Laws*, op. cit.
- 269 S. Puspa. (13 October 2020). *Jokowi and the oligarchs: Indonesia's elite set to win from Omnibus Bill*. GLOBE. Accessed 1 December. <https://southeastasiaglobe.com/omnibus-bill-oligarchs-indonesia/>; Amnesty International. (5 October 2020). *'Catastrophic' Omnibus Bill on Job Creation Passed into Law*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.amnesty.id/catastrophic-omnibus-bill-on-job-creation-passed-into-law/>; Institution of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH). (n.d.). *UN Working Group*, op. cit.
- 270 M. Sainato. (31 July 2023). *Big business lobbies*, op. cit.

- 271 L. Bombardi and A. Changoe. (2022). *Toxic Trading*. Friends of the Earth. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://friendsoftheearth.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Toxic-Trading-EN.pdf>; United Nations. (22 June 2022). *Brazil: "Poison package" draft bill on pesticides will undermine rights protection say UN experts*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2022/06/brazil-poison-package-draft-bill-pesticides-will-undermine-rights-protection>.
- 272 See methodology note, stat 2.2.
- 273 U. Gneiting et al. (2020). *Power, Profits and the Pandemic*, op. cit.
- 274 See methodology note, stat 2.7.
- 275 See methodology note, stat 2.8.
- 276 See methodology note, stat 2.8.
- 277 See methodology note, stat 2.9.
- 278 PPP (purchasing power parities) are a way to equalize the purchasing power of currencies. See methodology note, stat 2.10.
- 279 R. Gammarano. (2019). *The Working Poor: Or How a Job Is No Guarantee of Decent Living Conditions*. International Labour Organization. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---stat/documents/publication/wcms_696387.pdf
- 280 R. Vazquez-Alvarez et al. (2022). *Global Wage Report 2022–23*, op. cit.
- 281 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (11 July 2023). *OECD job markets remain tight though inflation is hitting real wages*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oecd.org/newsroom/oecd-job-markets-remain-tight-though-inflation-is-hitting-real-wages.htm#:~:text=Real%20hourly%20wages%20have%20fallen,an%20average%20decline%20of%203.8%25>
- 282 See methodology note, stat 1.1.
- 283 R. Vazquez-Alvarez et al. (2022). *Global Wage Report 2022–23*, op. cit.
- 284 See methodology note, stat. 1.1
- 285 L. Chancel et al. (2021). *World Inequality Report 2022*. World Inequality Lab. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://wir2022.wid.world/www-site/uploads/2023/03/D_FINAL_WIL_RIM_RAPPORT_2303.pdf
- 286 The World Bank Data. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.SPR.PC40?locations=ID-NA-R0-MX>.
- 287 See, e.g. 'Report to the Human Rights Council. 2019. Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism', op. cit.; J. Brunner and G. LeBaron. (2021). *Forced Labour Evidence Brief*, op. cit.
- 288 U. Gneiting et al. (2020). *Power, Profits and the Pandemic*, op. cit.
- 289 Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Distribution of Household Wealth in the U.S. since 1989. Q2 2023 Data at: <https://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/z1/dataviz/dfa/distribute/chart/#quarter:1.35;series:Corporate%20equities%20and%20mutual%20fund%20shares;demographic:race;population:1,3,5,7;units:shares;U.S. Census Bureau. Quick Facts. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US>
- 290 U. Gneiting et al. (2020). *Power, Profits and the Pandemic*, op. cit.
- 291 United Nations General Assembly. (2020). *Visit to Malaysia*. Accessed 1 December 2023. [Undocs.org/A/HRC/44/40/Add.1](https://undocs.org/A/HRC/44/40/Add.1); E. Mellino et al. (27 March 2023). 'They treat you like an animal': How British farms run on exploitation. The Bureau of Investigative Journalism. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/stories/2023-03-27/they-treat-you-like-an-animal-how-british-farms-run-on-exploitation>
- 292 S. Emran et al. (2019). *Made In Poverty: The True Price of Fashion*. Oxfam Australia. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Made-in-Poverty-the-True-Price-of-Fashion-Oxfam-.pdf>; <https://ousweb-prodv2-shared-media.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/media/documents/bn-workers-rights-supermarket-supply-chains-101019-en.pdf>; T. Zahn et al. (2022). *No Limits to Exploitation*. Oxfam Deutschland. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/2022_oxfam_no_limits_to_exploitation_en.pdf
- 293 D. Alejo Vázquez Pimentel et al. (2018). *Reward Work, Not Wealth*, op. cit.
- 294 R. Vazquez-Alvarez et al. (2022). *Global Wage Report 2022–23*, op. cit.
- 295 D. Alejo Vázquez Pimentel et al. (2018). *Reward Work, Not Wealth*, op. cit.
- 296 Ibid. H. Stewart. (30 July 2023). *Exploitation of care workers in England is 'appalling', says government adviser*. The Guardian. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2023/jul/30/exploitation-of-care-workers-in-england-is-appalling-says-government-adviser>
- 297 G. Azcona et al. (2023). *Progress*, op. cit.
- 298 Oxfam. (2021). *COVID-19 cost women globally over \$800 billion in lost income in one year*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/Covid-19-cost-women-globally-over-800-billion-lost-income-one-year>
- 299 L. Chancel et al. (2022). *World Inequality Report 2022*, op. cit.
- 300 See methodology note, stat 2.5.
- 301 C. Coffey et al. (2020). *Time To Care: Unpaid and underpaid care work and the global inequality crisis*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/time-to-care-unpaid-and-underpaid-care-work-and-the-global-inequality-crisis-620928/>
- 302 Kentikelenis et al. (2023). *The Middle East and North Africa Gap*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/the-middle-east-and-north-africa-gap-prosperity-for-the-rich-austerity-for-the-621549/>
- 303 This figure is an estimate based on wages alone. We recognize that the true, full value of unpaid care and social reproductive work cannot be captured in monetary terms.
- 304 Oxfam International. (n.d.). *Not all gaps are created equal: the true value of care work*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/not-all-gaps-are-created-equal-true-value-care-work#:~:text=A%20heavy%20and%20unequal%20responsibility,unpaid%20care%20work%20every%20day>
- 305 R. Wilshaw and R. Willoughby. (2019). *Workers' Rights in Supermarket Supply Chains*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620877/bn-workers-rights-supermarket-supply-chains-101019-en.pdf>
- 306 R. Wilshaw and R. Willoughby. (2019). *Workers' Rights*, op. cit.; J. Gardner et al. (2022). *Engendering Informality Statistics: Gaps and Opportunities*. International Labour Organization. Accessed 1 December 2023. [https://www.ilo.org/static/english/intserv/working-papers/wp084/index.html#:~:text=Regional%20data%20reveal%20that%20informality,compared%20to%2083%25%20of%20men;ILO. \(2017\). Purchasing practices and working conditions in global supply chains: Global Survey results. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---travail/documents/publication/wcms_556336.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/static/english/intserv/working-papers/wp084/index.html#:~:text=Regional%20data%20reveal%20that%20informality,compared%20to%2083%25%20of%20men;ILO. (2017). Purchasing practices and working conditions in global supply chains: Global Survey results. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---travail/documents/publication/wcms_556336.pdf)

- 307 C. Henry and J. Adams. (2018). *Spotlight on Sexual Violence and Harassment in Commercial Agriculture: Lower and Middle Income Countries*. International Labour Office. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/-inst/documents/publication/wcms_630672.pdf
- 308 S. Emran et al. (2019). *Made In Poverty*, op. cit.
- 309 Ibid.
- 310 M. Christensen, et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest Methodology Note*, op. cit.; OECD. (2022). *Corporate Tax Statistics*, op. cit.
- 311 OECD. (2023). *Corporate Tax Statistics 2023*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/taxation/corporate-tax-statistics-2023_f1f07219-en
- 312 M. Gardner and S. Wamhoff. (2021). *55 Corporations*, op. cit.
- 313 L. Wier and G. Zucman. (2022). *Global Profit Shifting, 1975–2019*. UNU-WIDER Working Paper. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.wider.unu.edu/node/240777>
- 314 Ibid.
- 315 EU Tax Observatory. (2023). 'Global Tax Evasion: Report 2024'. EU Tax Observatory. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.taxobservatory.eu/www-site/uploads/2023/10/global_tax_evasion_report_24.pdf
- 316 See methodology note, stat 2.6. The standard should be understood as a minimum threshold that does capture the full range of practices that would constitute responsible corporate tax behavior. See, e.g. T. Boerrilled. (2015). *Getting to Good: Towards responsible corporate tax behavior*. Christian Aid, Oxfam International, Action Aid. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/getting-good-towards-responsible-corporate-tax-behavior>
- 317 OECD. (2023) Corporate Tax Statistics 2023. Accessed on 20 November 2023. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/taxation/corporate-tax-statistics-2023_f1f07219-en. Data available at: <https://stat.link/xzwamc>
- 318 IMF. (2021). Fiscal Monitor April 2021. Data, Figure 2.12. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/FM/Issues/2021/03/29/fiscal-monitor-april-2021>; M. Christensen, et al. (2023) *Survival of the Richest*, op. cit.
- 319 OECD. (2021). International community strikes a ground-breaking tax deal for the digital age. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://web.archive.oecd.org/2021-10-20/612898-international-community-strikes-a-ground-breaking-tax-deal-for-the-digital-age.htm>.
- 320 Global Alliance for Tax Justice. (2021). *The 'deal of the rich' will not benefit developing countries*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://globaltaxjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/2021-10-08-Read-GATJs-statement-EN-PDF.pdf>; EU Tax Observatory. (2023). 'Global Tax Evasion: Report 2024'. EU Tax Observatory. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.taxobservatory.eu/www-site/uploads/2023/10/global_tax_evasion_report_24.pdf
- 321 Eurodad. (2023). More than 200 organisations and trade unions call for the adoption of the Africa Group resolution on a UN Tax Convention. <https://www.eurodad.org/more-than-200-civil-society-organisations-support-the-draft-resolution-on-promotion-of-inclusive-and-effective-international-tax-cooperation-at-the-un>; Tax Justice Network. (2023). UN adopts plans for historic tax reform. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://taxjustice.net/press/un-adopts-plans-for-historic-tax-reform/>
- 322 M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest*, op. cit.
- 323 See, e.g. E. Berkhout. (12 December 2016). *Tax battles*, op. cit.; M. Meinzer and C. Trautvetter. (2018). *Accounting (f)or Tax: The Global Battle for Corporate Transparency*. Tax Justice Network. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.taxjustice.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/MeinzerTrautvetter2018-AccountingTaxCBCR.pdf>; Oxfam International. (2014). *Business Among Friends: Why Corporate Tax Dodgers Are Not Yet Losing Sleep Over Global Tax Reform*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/316405/bp185-business-among-friends-corporate-tax-reform-120514-en.pdf?sequence=10>
- 324 E. Berkhout. (12 December 2016). *Tax battles*, op. cit.
- 325 B. Richter et al. (2008). 'Lobbying and Taxes.' *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(4), 893–909. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1082146; Alexander et al. (2009). 'Measuring Rates of Return for Lobbying Expenditures: An Empirical Case Study of Tax Breaks for Multinational Corporations'. *Journal of Law and Politics*, 25(401). Accessed 1 December 2023. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1375082
- 326 M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest*, op. cit.
- 327 World Bank. (2022). *Poverty and Shared Prosperity*, op. cit. 'CIT collects between 2 percent and 3 percent of GDP, and incidence is likely to be progressive. The exact incidence is subject to debate, but studies in OECD economies show that shareholders tend to bear more than half of the burden, the rest borne by workers or consumers. That shareholders often belong to the top of the income distribution suggests that CIT is progressive, especially in poorer economies where the workers of large firms are themselves well-off.'
- 328 E. Saez and G. Zucman. (2020). *The Triumph of Injustice*, op. cit.
- 329 M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest*, op. cit.; E. Berkhout. (12 December 2016). *Tax battles*, op. cit.; M. Keen et al. (2023). *International Tax Spillovers and Tangible Investment, with Implications for the Global Minimum Tax*. International Monetary Fund. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2023/08/04/International-Tax-Spillovers-and-Tangible-Investment-with-Implications-for-the-Global-536796>; S. Stausholm. (2017). *Rise of Ineffective Incentives: New Empirical Evidence on Tax Holidays in Developing Countries*. SorArXiv Papers. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/4sn3k/>; H. Kronfol and V. Steenberg. (2020). *Evaluating the Costs and Benefits of Corporate Tax Incentives*. The World Bank Group. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/47e1b4ea-ae81-5eb4-8cd4-70e354f433f1/content>; S. Gechert and P. Heimberger. (2022). Do Corporate Tax Cuts Boost Economic Growth? European Economic Review. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0014292122000885>
- 330 E. Berkhout. (12 December 2016). *Tax battles*, op. cit.
- 331 E. Saez and G. Zucman. (2020). *The Triumph of Injustice*, op. cit.
- 332 M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest*, op. cit.
- 333 Global Alliance for Tax Justice et al. (2021). *Framing Feminist Taxation*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://globaltaxjustice.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/2021-06-02-Download-the-guide-in-English-EN-PDF.pdf>; M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest*, op. cit.
- 334 M. Christensen et al. (2023). *Survival of the Richest*, op. cit.
- 335 A. Kentikelenis et al. (2023). *The Middle East and North Africa Gap*, op. cit.
- 336 Global Alliance for Tax Justice et al. (2021). *Framing Feminist Taxation*, op. cit.; R. Noble. (2018). *From Rhetoric to Rights*, op. cit.
- 337 E. Akinwuto, (10 June 2020). *Nigeria to cut healthcare spending by 40% despite coronavirus cases climbing*. *The Guardian*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2020/jun/10/nigeria-to-cut-healthcare-spending-by-40-despite-coronavirus-cases-climbing>; WHO and Integrated African Health Observatory. (2023). *Maternal mortality: The urgency of a systemic and multisectoral approach in mitigating maternal deaths in Africa*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://files.who.int/afahobckpcontainer/production/files/IAHO_Maternal_Mortality_Regional_Factsheet.pdf
- 338 E. Berkhout. (12 December 2016). *Tax battles*, op. cit.

- 339 OECD. (2022). *Corporate Tax Statistics: Fourth Edition*, op. cit.
- 340 Missing Profits. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://missingprofits.world>. L. Wier and G. Zucman. (2022). *Global Profit Shifting, 1975–2019*. WIDER Working Paper 2022/121. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.wider.unu.edu/node/240777>; Tax Justice Network Team. (2023). *State of Tax Justice 2023*. Tax Justice Network. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://taxjustice.net/reports/the-state-of-tax-justice-2023/>
- 341 Report to the UN General Assembly. (2018). *Extreme Poverty and Human Rights*, op. cit.; R. Noble. (2018). *From Rhetoric to Rights*, op. cit.
- 342 See, e.g. the box on p. 39 of Ortiz and Cummings. (2022). 'END AUSTERITY: A Global Report on Budget Cuts and Harmful Social Reforms in 2022–25'. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/end-austerity-global-report-budget-cuts-and-harmful-social-reforms-2022-25>
- 343 See, e.g. Corporate Accountability International. (2014). *Public Water Works: The Case for Prioritizing Our Most Essential Public Services*. Accessed 2023. <https://www.corporateaccountability.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Public-Water-Works-2014.pdf>; and D. Cohen and A. Mikaelian. (2021). *The Privatization of Everything*. New York City: The New Press.
- 344 Oxfam. (7 April 2014). *A Dangerous Diversion*. Policy Papers. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/dangerous-diversion>; A. Marriott and A. Maitland (2021). *The Great Vaccine Robbery*. The People's Vaccine Alliance. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://oi-files-cng-v2-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/uganda.oxfam.org/s3fs-public/file_attachments/The%20Great%20Vaccine%20Robbery%20Policy%20Brief%20final.pdf
- 345 M. Romero. (2018). *History RePPeated – How Public-private Partnerships Are Failing*. Eurodad. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.eurodad.org/historyrepeated>; K. Bayliss et al. (2021). 'Uneven Outcomes from Private Infrastructure Finance: Evidence from Two Case Studies'. *Development in Practice*, 31(7), 934–45.
- 346 N. Sylla and D. Gabor. (14 January 2021). *Planting budgetary time bombs in Africa: the Macron Doctrine En Marche*. Committee for the Abolition of Illegitimate Debt. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.cadtm.org/Planting-budgetary-time-bombs-in-Africa-the-Macron-Doctrine-En-Marche>; K. Bayliss and E. Waeyenberge. (2017). 'Unpacking the Public Private Partnership Revival'. *The Journal of Development Studies*. 54(4), 577–93; Transnational Institute. (2020). *The Future is Public*. TNI. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.tni.org/files/publication-downloads/futureispublic_online_def.pdf; K. Bayliss et al. (2021). 'Uneven Outcomes from Private Infrastructure Finance', op. cit.
- 347 A. Cepparulo, G. Eusepi and L. Giuriato. (2019). 'Public Private Partnership and Fiscal Illusion: A Systematic Review'. *Journal of Infrastructure Policy and Development*, 3(2), 288–89. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v3i2.1157>; Ontario Auditor General, *Annual Report 2014*, p. 7. https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arreports/en14/2014AR_en_web.pdf; ITPI (2021). Issues and considerations for value for money analyses. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.inthepublicinterest.org/wp-content/uploads/ITPI_Value_for_Money_Memo_Oct2021.pdf; K.S. Jomo et al. (2016). *Public-Private Partnerships and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Fit for purpose?* DESA Working Paper No. 148. UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, p. 15. https://www.un.org/esa/desa/papers/2016/wp148_2016.pdf; National Audit Office (2018). *PFI and PF2*, p. 15. <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/PFI-and-PF2.pdf>.
- 348 K. Bayliss and E. Waeyenberge. (2017). 'Unpacking the Public Private Partnership Revival', op. cit.
- 349 World Bank Group. (2017). *Maximizing Finance for Development*, op cit; USAID. (2018). *Private Sector Engagement Policy*, op. cit.
- 350 K. Bayliss et al. (2020). *The Use of Development Funds for De-risking Private Investment: How Effective is it in Delivering Development Results?* European Department. Policy Department. Accessed 1 December 2023. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/603486/EXP0_STU\(2020\)603486_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2020/603486/EXP0_STU(2020)603486_EN.pdf); K. Bayliss and E. Waeyenberge. (2017). 'Unpacking the Public Private Partnership Revival', op. cit.
- 351 D. Gabor. (2021). 'The Wall Street Consensus'. *Development and Change*, 52(3), 429–59.
- 352 F. Schulte. (14 November 2022). *Sick profit*, op. cit.; *The Guardian*. (21 May 2023). *The Guardian view on England's water companies*, op. cit.; A. Gupta et al. (2021). *Owner Incentives and Performance in Healthcare*, op. cit.; A. Borsa, et al. (2023). *Evaluating trends in private equity ownership and impacts on health outcomes, costs, and quality: systematic review*. *BMJ*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2023-075244>
- 353 B. Khawaja et al. (2021). *Public Transport, Private Profit*. Center for Human Rights and Global Justice. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://chrj.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Report-Public-Transport-Private-Profit.pdf>
- 354 T. Kim. (30 May 2019). *How Uber Hopes to Profit From Public Transit*. *The New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/30/opinion/uber-stock.html>; J. DeManuelle-Hall. (8 March 2022). *Texas union activists fight 'microtransit' privatization*. Labor Notes. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://labornotes.org/blogs/2022/03/texas-union-activists-fight-microtransit-privatization>.
- 355 Via. *6 steps to launch a microtransit service in weeks, not months*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://info.ridewithvia.com/guide/neoride?utm_source=ride&utm_medium=alert-banner&utm_campaign=neoride_guide&utm_content=neoride_guide; Via. (13 February 2023). *Via closes financing round at \$3.5B valuation, raising \$110M to expand TransitTech portfolio*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/via-closes-financing-round-at-3-5b-valuation-raising-110m-to-expand-transitech-portfolio-301745145.html>.
- 356 Precedence Research. <https://www.precedenceresearch.com/hospital-services-market>. Accessed 13 December 2023.
- 357 A. Taneja and A. Sarkar. (2023). *First, Do No Harm*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2023-06/Do%20no%20harm%20-%20English%20Report.pdf>
- 358 J. Leigland. (2018). 'Public-Private Partnerships in Developing Countries: The Emerging Evidence-based Critique'. *Research Observer*, 33(1), 103–34.
- 359 UK Competitions & Markets Authority. (2022). *Children's social care market study final report*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/childrens-social-care-market-study-final-report/final-report-summary>
- 360 The Business Research Company. (2023). *Water and Sewage Global Market Report*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.thebusinessresearchcompany.com/report/water-and-sewage-global-market-report>
- 361 S. Anderson. (2023). *Executive Excess 2023*. Institute for Policy Studies. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://ips-dc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/EE23-FINAL-aug-23-23.pdf>
- 362 See, e.g. R. Schomaker. (2020). 'Conceptualizing Corruption in Public Private Partnerships'. *Public Organization Review* 20(4), 807–20. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-020-00473-6>; and C. Cordelli, *The Privatized State*, Princeton University Press, p. 284. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv125jsqj>
- 363 D. Alejo Vázquez Pimentel et al. (2018). *Reward Work, Not Wealth*, op. cit.
- 364 A. Taneja and A. Sarkar. (2023). *First, Do No Harm*, op. cit.; A. Marriott. (2023). *Sick Development*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oxfamilibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/621529/bp-sick-development-funding-for-profit-private-hospitals-260623-en.pdf?sequence=14>
- 365 J. Walker et al. (2019). *The Power of Education to Fight Inequality*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/power-education-fight-inequality>.

- 366 I. Ortiz et al. (2018). *Reversing Pension Privatizations*. International Labour Organisation. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---soc_sec/documents/publication/wcms_648574.pdf
- 367 Independent Evaluation Group. (18 June 2022). *An Evaluation of International Finance Corporation Investments in K-12 Private Schools*. World Bank Group. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/evaluations/evaluation-international-finance-corporation-investments-k-12-private-schools>; A. Marriott. (2023). *Sick Development*, op. cit.
- 368 A. Marriott. (2023). *Sick Development*, op. cit.
- 369 D. Cohen and A. Mikaelian. (2021). *The Privatization of Everything*, op. cit, p. 209.
- 370 J. LaFleur. (2020). 'Centering Race in Contemporary Educational Privatization Policies: The Genealogy Of U.S. 'Private School Choice' and its Implications for Research'. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 26 (2), 205–225. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2020.1798384>; D.N. Thompson Dorsey and G.D. Roulhac. (2019). 'From Desegregation to Privatization: A Critical Race Policy Analysis of School Choice and Educational Opportunity in North Carolina'. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94(4). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1648953>; M. Offutt-Chaney. (2022). 'Black Crisis' and the 'Likely' Privatization of Public Education in New Orleans and Liberia'. *Critical Studies in Education*, 63(2), 180–195. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2019.1662464>
- 371 UNGA. (2013). 'Contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance'. A/68/333. Accessed 1 December. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N13/431/33/PDF/N1343133.pdf?OpenElement>; UNGA. (2022). 'Racism, racial discrimination and the right to development: Thematic study by the Expert Mechanism on the Right to Development'. A/HRC/51/37. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G22/387/64/PDF/G2238764.pdf?OpenElement>.
- 372 N. Jadhav and A. Taneja. (2022) *The private health sector in India*, op. cit.
- 373 A. Taneja and Noopur. (2022) *Private schools in India*, op. cit.
- 374 H. Mandel and M. Semyonov. (2021). 'The gender-race intersection and the "sheltering-effect" of public-sector employment'. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 71, 100581. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0276562421000019?via%3DIihub>; G. Wilson, et al. (2015) *Racial Income Inequality*, op. cit.
- 375 M. Lawson. (2019) *Public good or private wealth*, op. cit.; D. Abed and F. Kelleher, (2022). *The Assault of Austerity*, op. cit.; Report to the General Assembly. (2018). The Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://undocs.org/A/73/179>
- 376 ILO. (2022). *Pay transparency can address the gender pay gap*. Geneva. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_856203/lang--en/index.htm
- 377 T. Mukhtarova, F.A. Baig and Z. Hasnain. (2021). *Five facts on gender equity in the public sector*. Governance for Development World Bank Blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/governance/five-facts-gender-equity-public-sector>
- 378 Gender & Development Network. (2019). *How social protection, public services and infrastructure impact women's rights*. GADN Briefing. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/536c4ee8e4b0b60bc6ca7c74/t/5c34c34cb8a04568549dc77d/1546961742579/How+social+protection%2C+public+services%2C+infrastructure+impact+women%27s+rights.pdf>; The National Network on Environments and Women's Health. (2009). The significance of privatization and commercialization trends for women's health: Submission to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights for the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations related to access to safe drinking water and sanitation. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Water/ContributionsPSP/Council_of_Canadians.pdf
- 379 D. Abed and F. Kelleher. (2022). *The Assault of Austerity*, op. cit.; Brown, Rebecca. (2010). 'Unequal burden: water privatisation and women's human rights in Tanzania'. *Gender & Development*, 18(1), 59–67. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/unequal-burden-water-privatisation-and-womens-human-rights-in-tanzania-131723/>
- 380 A. Taneja and N. Jadhav. (2022). *Experiences of women while availing services in the Private healthcare System in India*. Oxfam India. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfamindia.org/genderprivatisationhealth>; J. Kaufman and F. Jing. (2002). 'Privatisation of Health Services and the Reproductive Health of Rural Chinese Women'. *Health Sector Reforms: Implications for Sexual and Reproductive Health Services*, 10 (20), 108–116, 2 December 2023. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3776331>; R. Riddell et al. (2021). *Wrong Prescription: The Impact of Privatizing Healthcare in Kenya*. The Economic and Social Rights Centre – Hakijamii and the Center for Human Rights and Global Justice. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://chrj.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Report_Wrong-Prescription_Eng_.pdf.
- 381 E. Iversen and A. Begue. (2017). *The effects of privatisation on girls' access to free, quality public education in Nepal: Country Report*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://actionaid.org/sites/default/files/publications/nepal_country_report.pdf; A. Kentikelenis et al. (2023). *The Middle East and North Africa Gap: Prosperity for the rich, austerity for the rest*, op. cit.
- 382 J. Stinson. (2004). 'Why Privatization Is a Women's Issue'. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 23(3-4), 18–22 (paras. 80–81). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://cws.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cws/article/view/6232/5420>; UNGA. (18 July 2018). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://undocs.org/A/73/179>; D.F. Haynes. (2010). 'Lessons From Bosnia's Arizona Market: Harm To Women In A Neoliberalized Postconflict Reconstruction Process'. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 158(6), 1779–829. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/29-haynes158upalrev17792010pdf>; L.A. Khalfalla. (2011). *Socio-economic Impacts of Privatisation on Women Made Redundant from Sudan's Banking and Manufacturing Sectors*. Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham. Accessed 1 December 2023. <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/30668/1/580176.pdf>
- 383 C.R. Enriquez and M.L. Blanco. (2021). *Introduction: Public private partnerships & women's human rights: An exploration in the Global South*. Dawn Informs. Accessed 2023. https://dawnnet.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/DAWN_Informs_on_PPPs_March2021.pdf.
- 384 Report to the Human Rights Council. (2023). 'The Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity'. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/thematic-reports/ahrc5337-report-independent-expert-protection-against-violence-and>
- 385 Oxfam International. (26 June 2023). *Poor people being bypassed or bankrupted as rich countries pour development billions into private healthcare*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/poor-people-being-bypassed-or-bankrupted-rich-countries-pour-development-billions>
- 386 Ibid.
- 387 A. Taneja and A. Sarkar. (2023). *First, Do No Harm: Examining the impact of the IFC's support to private healthcare in India*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/first-do-no-harm-examining-impact-ifcs-support-private-healthcare-india>.
- 388 A. Khalfan et al. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 389 See, e.g. Influence Map. (2023). *The Oil and Gas Industry's Policy Advocacy in Africa and Europe*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://influencemap.org/report/The-European-Oil-Gas-Industry-in-Europe-Africa-22693>
- 390 Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.; IEA Analysis. (2020). *The Oil and Gas Industry in Energy Transitions*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.iea.org/reports/the-oil-and-gas-industry-in-energy-transitions>.

- 391 C. Krauss. (18 January 2022). *Exxon sets a 2050 goal for net-zero greenhouse gas emissions*. *The New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/18/business/exxon-net-zero-emissions.html>; UN Environment Programme. (n.d.) Net-Zero Banking Alliance. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.unepfi.org/net-zero-banking/>; Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 392 A. Sen and D. Nafkote. (2021). *Tightening the Net: Net Zero Climate Targets – Implications for Land and Food Equity*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/tightening-the-net-net-zero-climate-targets-implications-for-land-and-food-equ-621205/>
- 393 See, e.g. Climatefiles. (n.d.). *1996 API to White House on Greenhouse Emissions*. Accessed 1 December 2023. www.climatefiles.com/trade-group/american-petroleum-institute/1996-api-white-house-greenhouse; J.H. Cushman (1998) *Industrial group plans to battle climate treaty*, op. cit.; J.H. Cushman. (1997). *Intense Lobbying against Global Warming Treaty*. *New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/1997/12/07/us/intense-lobbying-against-global-warming-treaty.html>; H. Tabuchi. (2021). *Oil producers used Facebook to counter President Biden’s clean message, a study shows*. *New York Times*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/05/climate/oil-facebook-ads-biden.html>.
- 394 For example, in the USA, according to one database, in 2022, the oil and gas lobby spent more than US\$125m on lobbying the national government (two-thirds of the lobbyists were former government officials). Open Secrets. (2022). *Industry Profile: Oil & Gas*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.opensecrets.org/federal-lobbying/industries/summary?cycle=2022&id=E01>; Global Witness. (10 November 2022). *636 fossil fuel lobbyists granted access to COP27*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/campaigns/fossil-gas/636-fossil-fuel-lobbyists-granted-access-cop27/>; Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 395 Influence Map. (2023). *Fossil Fuels Climate Lobbying Update #11*. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://influencemap.org/site/data/000/023/Fossil_Fuels_Climate_Lobbying_Update_July_2023.pdf
- 396 Influence Map. (2023). *Industry lobbying imbalance*, op. cit.
- 397 Influence Map. (2018). *How the US Auto Industry is Dismantling the World’s Most Successful Climate Policy*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://lobbymap.org/report/How-the-US-auto-industry-is-dismantling-the-US-s-most-successful-climate-change-policy-5c079bd28ca4e219519afa0ae462db08>
- 398 Influence Map. (2023). *Anti-ESG and the Fossil Fuel Sector*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://lobbymap.org/report/Anti-ESG-and-the-Fossil-Fuel-Sector-21873>.
- 399 Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit., Corporate Europe Observatory (2021). *Stop the revolving door: fossil fuel policy influencers*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://corporateeurope.org/en/stop-revolving-door>
- 400 G. Supran and N. Oreskes. (18 November 2021). *The forgotten oil ads that told us climate change was nothing*. *The Guardian*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/nov/18/the-forgotten-oil-ads-that-told-us-climate-change-was-nothing>
- 401 A. Maitland et al. (2022). *Carbon Billionaires*, op. cit.
- 402 Rainforest Action Network et al. (2023). *Banking on Climate Chaos: Fossil Fuel Finance Report 2023*, op. cit.
- 403 A. Maitland et al. (2022). *Carbon Billionaires*, op. cit.
- 404 J. Setzer and C. Higham. (2022). *Global Trends in Climate Change Litigation: 2022 Snapshot*. Grantham Research Institute. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Global-trends-in-climate-change-litigation-2022-snapshot.pdf>
- 405 EarthRights International. (2022). *Silencing Indigenous Communities: The case of a Lignite Coal Mine in Omkoi District, Thailand*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://earthrights.org/wp-content/uploads/Omkoi-Case-Study-2022.pdf>; EarthRights International (2022); *The Fossil Fuel Industry’s use of SLAPPs*, op. cit.; Greenpeace International. (2023). *Greenpeace Italy and ReCommon hit with “SLAPP” lawsuit by fossil fuel company ENI. Italy*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.greenpeace.org/international/press-release/60969/eni-slapp-lawsuit-fossil-fuel-climate-greenpeace-italy-recommon/>; Business & Human Rights Resource Centre (2019). *Silencing the Critics - How big polluters try to paralyse environmental and human rights advocacy through the courts*. Guidance Note. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://media.business-humanrights.org/media/documents/files/Big_Polluters_and_SLAPPs_Briefing_FINAL.pdf.
- 406 United Nations General Assembly. (2022). *Corporate Influence in the Political and Regulatory Sphere*. Accessed 1 December 2023. [Undocs.org/A/77/201](https://undocs.org/A/77/201); United Nations General Assembly. (2021). *The Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Guidance on Ensuring Respect for Human Rights Defenders*. Accessed 1 December 2023. [Undocs.org/A/HRC/47/39/Add.2](https://undocs.org/A/HRC/47/39/Add.2)
- 407 S. Malo. (28 May 2019) *U.N. reform needed to stop companies fighting climate rules: Nobel laureate Stiglitz*. Reuters. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-climatechange-trade-stiglitz/u-n-reform-needed-to-stop-companies-fighting-climate-rules-nobel-laureate-stiglitz-idUSKCN1SZ04Y>
- 408 United Nations General Assembly. (2023). *Paying Polluters*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://undocs.org/A/78/168>
- 409 Ibid.
- 410 Ibid.
- 411 Ibid.
- 412 M. Colodenco et al. (2023). *Southern Debt Report: Characteristics and Challenges*. Latindadd and Afrodad. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://globaltaxjustice.org/libraries/latindadd-afrodad-southern-debt-report-characteristics-and-challenges/>
- 413 Oxfam. (2019). *Forced From Home: Climate Fuelled Displacement*. Oxfam media briefing. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/620914/mb-climate-displacement-cop25-021219-en.pdf>; United Nations. (23 June 2022). *“Intolerable tide” of people displaced by climate change: UN expert*. Press release. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2022/06/intolerable-tide-people-displaced-climate-change-unexpert#:~:text=The%20expert%20said%20that%20of,displacement%20due%20to%20armed%20conflict>
- 414 Oxfam. (2022). *Hunger In a Heating World*. Oxfam media briefing. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2022-09/ENG%20Climate%20Hunger%20BRIEF_16%20Sept%2022_0.pdf
- 415 Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 416 United Nations General Assembly. (2019). *Climate Change and Poverty*. Accessed 1 December 2023. [Undocs.org/A/HRC/41/39](https://undocs.org/A/HRC/41/39)
- 417 Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 418 Ibid.; M. Chiponda and A. Songole. (2021). *A Feminist Analysis of the Triple Crisis: Climate Change, Debt, and COVID-19 in Zimbabwe and Kenya*. Feminist Action Nexus. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://wedo.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ActionNexus_TripleCrisisBrief_EN.pdf; UN Women. (28 February 2022). *Explainer: How gender inequality and climate change are interconnected*. UN Women News. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news-stories/explainer/2022/02/explainer-how-gender-inequality-and-climate-change-are-interconnected>
- 419 Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.
- 420 Ibid.

- 421 Oxfam. (2023). *Climate Equality*, op. cit.; Rainforest Action Network (2023). p. 5 of 'Banking on Climate Chaos: Fossil Fuel Finance report 2023'. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.bankingonclimatechaos.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/BOCC_2023_vf.pdf
- 422 M. Mazzucato and H.L. Li. (2020). 'The Entrepreneurial State and public options: socialising risks and rewards'. UCL Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose Working Paper 2020–20, Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/public-purpose/sites/public-purpose/files/final_the_entrepreneurial_state_and_public_options.pdf
- 423 M. Mazzucato. (2023). 'Governing the economics of the common good: from correcting market failures to shaping collective goals'. UCL Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose, Working Paper Series (IIPP WP 2023-08). Forthcoming in *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/bartlett/public-purpose/wp2023-08>
- 424 World Bank Group. *State-Owned Enterprises: Understanding their market effects and the need for competitive neutrality*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/739371594131714315/15444-WB-SOE-WEB.pdf>
- 425 V. Gaspar, P. Medas and J. Ralyea. (2020). *State-Owned Enterprises in the Time of COVID-19*. IMF Blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2020/05/07/blog-state-owned-enterprises-in-the-time-of-covid-19>
- 426 J. Stiglitz. (2021). 'The proper role of government in the market economy: the case of the post-COVID recovery'. *Journal of Government and Economy*, 1. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jge.2021.100004>
- 427 M. Mazzucato and H.L. Li. (2020). 'Is it time to nationalise the pharmaceutical industry?' op.cit.
- 428 Federal Trade Commission. (2023). *FTC Sues Amazon for Illegally Maintaining Monopoly Power*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/09/ftc-sues-amazon-illegally-maintaining-monopoly-power>; European Commission. (14 June 2023). *Antitrust: Commission sends Statement of Objections to Google over abusive practices in online advertising technology*. Press release. Brussels. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_23_3207
- 429 Scott Morton, FM (2016) "How Do You Enforce Antitrust Law in a Global Marketplace?" Yale Insights: Ideas from the Yale School of Management, Accessed 2 December 2023, insights.som.yale.edu/insights/how-do-you-enforce-antitrust-law-in-global-marketplace; UNDP (2021). *Regional Human Development Report 2021. Trapped: High Inequality and Low growth in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Chapter 3. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/latinamerica/undp-rblac-RHDR-UNDP_C03-EN.pdf
- 430 D. Hearn and M. Meagher. (2022). *Stakeholder Capitalism's Next Frontier: Pro- or Anti-monopoly?* American Economic Liberties Project. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.economicliberties.us/our-work/stakeholder-capitalisms-next-frontier/>; M. Meagher. (24 March 2021). *Adaptive Antitrust*. ABA Spring Meeting 2021 Course Materials, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3816662>
- 431 M. Watzinger and M. Schnitzer. (2022). 'The Breakup of the Bell System and its Impact on US Innovation'. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.monika-schnitzer.com/uploads/4/9/4/1/49415675/watzinger_schnitzer_breakup_of_bell.pdf
- 432 F. Poegel. (2022). 'Competition and Innovation: The Breakup of I Farben.' Boston University School of Law Research paper No # 22-24. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4199672
- 433 T. Babina et al. (2023). 'Antitrust Enforcement Increases Economic Activity', op. cit.
- 434 D. Baker. "PATENTS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INEQUALITY". *The Great Polarization: How Ideas, Power, and Policies Drive Inequality*. R. von Arnim and J.E. Stiglitz (eds.). New York Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press, 2022, 275–296. <https://doi.org/10.7312/arni19926-011>
- 435 For example, in access to vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic. Oxfam. (5 February 2021). *Monopolies causing "artificial rationing" in COVID-19 crisis in three biggest global vaccine giants sit on sidelines*. Press release. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/monopolies-causing-artificial-rationing-covid-19-crisis-3-biggest-global-vaccine>
- 436 E. Perot. (2023). 'Technology transfer, climate change and the developing countries: the difficulties posed by green patents'. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law and Practice*, 18(5), 397–406. <https://academic.oup.com/jiplp/article-abstract/18/5/397/7160514?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- 437 N. Abernathy and K. Bozarth. (2019). *Reviving Public Power through Public Options*. Roosevelt Institute Blog. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://rooseveltinstitute.org/2019/04/29/reviving-public-power-through-public-options/>
- 438 OHCHR. (2012). *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework*. Accessed 1 December 2023, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/publications/reference-publications/guiding-principles-business-and-human-rights>
- 439 Actionaid. (2021). *Feminists for a binding treaty: Key Recommendations on the third revised draft dated 17 August 2021 of the legally binding instrument to regulate, in international human rights law, the activities of transnational corporations and other business enterprises*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://actionaid.nl/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Formatted-Final-F4BT-key-recommendations-2021-3rd-treaty-draft-ENGLISH.docx-2-1.pdf>
- 440 European Commission. (23 February 2022). *Just and sustainable economy: Commission lays down rules for companies to respect human rights and environment in global value chains*. Press release. Brussels. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_22_1145
- 441 Oxfam International. (2023). *Closing the loopholes: Recommendations for an EU corporate sustainability law which works for rights holders*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/ior60/6539/2023/en/>
- 442 R. Mhlanga et al. (2023). *Valuing Women's Work: A framework for business on gender equality and decent work*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/valuing-womens-work-a-framework-for-business-on-gender-equality-and-decent-work-621552/>
- 443 J. Blundell. (2021). 'Wage responses to gender pay gap reporting requirements'. Centre for Economic Performance Discussion paper no 1750. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/dp1750.pdf>
- 444 For example, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.
- 445 F. Rhodes. (2016). *Women and the 1%: How extreme economic inequality and gender inequality must be tackled together*. Oxfam International. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/women-and-1>
- 446 A. Addati, U. Cattaneo and E. Pozzan. (2022). *Care for work: Investing in care leave and services for a more gender equal world of work*. ILO. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_838653.pdf
- 447 J. Bivens and J. Kandra. (2023). *CEO pay slightly declined in 2022*. Economic Policy Institute. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.epi.org/publication/ceo-pay-in-2022/#full-report>
- 448 X. Chen, W. Torsin and A. Tsang. (2021). *International differences in the CEO gender pay gap*. *Corporate Governance: An international review*. 30(5), 516–541, Accessed 2 December 2023. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/corg.12421>

- 449 K. Haan. (2023). *Gender Pay Gap Statistics in 2023*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/advisor/business/gender-pay-gap-statistics/>
- 450 See, e.g. in the USA: W. Williams. (2023). *Wage gaps by Race: its history, importance, and impact*. Investopedia. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.investopedia.com/wage-gaps-by-race-5073258>
- 451 See methodology note, stat 1.9.
- 452 S. Hebous, D. Prihardini and N. Vernor. (2022). 'Excess Profit Taxes: Historical Perspective and Contemporary Relevance'. IMF Working paper. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2022/09/16/Excess-Profit-Taxes-Historical-Perspective-and-Contemporary-Relevance-523550>
- 453 Tax Justice Network. (n.d.). What is a global asset register? Accessed 4 December 2023. <https://taxjustice.net/faq/what-is-a-global-asset-register/>
- 454 Global Alliance for Tax Justice. (2023). *Historic UN Tax Vote - A Tremendous Win for Africa and the Global Fight for tax Justice*. Global Alliance for Tax Justice. Sao Paulo. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://globaltaxjustice.org/news/historic-un-tax-vote-a-tremendous-win-for-africa-and-the-global-fight-for-tax-justice/>
- 455 Ibid.
- 456 M. Conway et al. *Race and Gender Wealth Equity and the role of Employee Share Ownership*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Race-and-Gender-Wealth-Equity-and-the-Role-of-Employee-Share-Ownership.pdf>
- 457 A. Maitland and S. Ciencia. (2018). *The Future of Business: Shaping inclusive growth in South-East Asia*. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://oi-files-cng-v2-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/asia.oxfam.org/s3fs-public/file_attachments/Shaping-Inclusive-Growth-in-Southeast-Asia-Full-Report.pdf
- 458 CafeDirect audited accounts for 2022. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.cafedirect.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/FY2022-Cafedirect-plc-Statutory-Accounts-signed.pdf>
- 459 CafeDirect. (2021). *Impact Report 2021*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.cafedirect.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/2021-IMPACT-REPORT.pdf>
- 460 E. McCormick. (2022). *Patagonia's billionaire owner gives away company to fight climate crisis*. The Guardian. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/sep/14/patagonias-billionaire-owner-gives-away-company-to-fight-climate-crisis-yvon-chouinard>
- 461 S. Smith. (2014). Promoting cooperatives: an information guide to ILO Recommendation No. 193. International Labour Organization. Accessed 1 December 2023. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/---coop/documents/publication/wcms_311447.pdf
- 462 B. Doherty et al. (2020). 'Creating the New Economy: Business models that put people and planet first'. White Rose Research Report. Accessed 2023. https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/155977/1/Buisness_Model_Report_.pdf
- 463 H. Beardon. (2020). The World Fair Trade Organization: Scaling equitable business models. Oxfam. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/621104/cs-world-fair-trade-organization-201120-en.pdf?sequence=1>
- 464 J. Cox. (2018). *More people called David and Steve lead FTSE 100 companies than women and ethnic minorities*. The Independent. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/women-ftse-100-gender-discrimination-pay-gap-board-representation-chief-executive-a8244361.html>
- 465 B. Doherty et al. (2020). 'Creating the New Economy: Business models that put people and planet first', op. cit.
- 466 T. Dudley and E.s Rouen. (2021). *The Big Benefits of Employee Ownership*. Harvard Business Review. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://hbr.org/2021/05/the-big-benefits-of-employee-ownership>
- 467 I. Albizuri. (2023). *The Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Framework: Mondragon case*. https://social.desa.un.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/ALBIZURI_Paper_1.pdf; J. Neumann. (2022). *How a Worker-Owned Business Model in Spain is Keeping Inequality in Check*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2022-06-30/worker-owned-business-model-in-spain-is-keeping-inequality-in-check>
- 468 Oxfam Brazil. (2023). *Combate às desigualdades volta com força à ONU em discurso de Lula*. (Portuguese). Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.oxfam.org.br/noticias/combate-as-desigualdades-volta-com-forca-a-onu-em-discurso-de-lula/>
- 469 A. Isaac. (2022). *UN agrees global tax rules resolution giving developing national greater say*. The Guardian. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/nov/23/un-agrees-global-tax-rules-resolution-giving-developing-nations-greater-say>
- 470 MSF. (2023). *MSF responds to groundbreaking news that Johnson & Johnson will not enforce patents on key TB drug bedaquiline in low-and middle-income countries*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://msfsouthasia.org/msf-responds-to-groundbreaking-news-that-johnson-johnson-will-not-enforce-patents-on-key-tb-drug-bedaquiline-in-low-and-middle-income-countries/>
- 471 Schiphol Airport. (2023). *Schiphol to be quieter, cleaner and better: night closure, ban on private jets and people first*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://news.schiphol.com/schiphol-to-be-quieter-cleaner-and-better-night-closure-ban-on-private-jets-and-people-first/>
- 472 Reuters. (2022). *Climate activists block private jets at Amsterdam's Schiphol Airport*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.reuters.com/business/cop/activists-block-private-jet-traffic-schiphol-airport-2022-11-05/>
- 473 R. Neate. (2022). *Millionaires call on governments worldwide to 'tax us now'*. The Guardian. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2022/jan/19/millionaires-call-on-governments-worldwide-to-tax-us-now>
- 474 International Cooperative Alliance. Retrieved from <https://www.ica.coop/en/cooperatives/facts-and-figures>
- 475 Aljazeera. (2023). *US trade commission files anti-trust lawsuit against online retailer Amazon*. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/9/26/us-trade-commission-files-anti-trust-lawsuit-against-online-retailer-amazon>
- 476 A. Hern and L. O'Carroll. (2023). *EU regulator orders Google to sell part of ad-tech business*. The Guardian. Accessed 1 December 2023. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jun/14/eu-regulator-google-sell-ad-tech-business-competition-commission>

Oxfam

Oxfam is an international confederation of 21 organizations, working with its partners and allies, reaching out to millions of people around the world. Together, we tackle inequalities to end poverty and injustice, now and in the long term – for an equal future. Please write to any of the agencies for further information or visit www.oxfam.org

Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)

Oxfam Aotearoa (www.oxfam.org.nz)

Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)

Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)

Oxfam Brasil (www.oxfam.org.br)

Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)

Oxfam Colombia (www.oxfamcolombia.org)

Oxfam Denmark (www.oxfam.dk)

Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)

Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)

Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)

Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)

Oxfam Intermón (Spain) (www.oxfamintermon.org)

Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)

Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)

Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)

Oxfam Novib (Netherlands) (www.oxfamnovib.nl)

Oxfam Québec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)

Oxfam South Africa (www.oxfam.org.za)

KEDV (www.kedv.org.tr)



OXFAM